Contemplating Queer Vigilantism in The Context of Bangladesh and in General the Third World

I wrote this after an lgbt individual perished from an accident. Their partner could not give consent to putting them on life support as their relationship was not legally recognized. The individual died. I need you to understand. I need you to understand we are dying from the lack of marriage rights. Marriage is not a luxurious item of personal freedom for us.

I'm not going to justify lgbt people's existence in this manifesto. I am not going to convince you to give a shit about lgbts. If you're lgbt I'm not gonna convince you to do what I think needs to be done. This manifesto exists to formulate and verbalize the thoughts of those who already feel the way that I do.

Theocratic extremism will rise in Bangladesh, more and more, the still-surviving geopolitical overlords have ordained it so— in the final battle there's only one way out.

As the evil empire of AmeriKKKa collapses and its funding of religious extremists worldwide dwindles, remember: if you don't fight for lgbt rights now, you won't get it or even get to fight for it in the next world order either. You need to get your rights before and while the new geopolitical arrangement reorders and establishes itself. You won't get it afterwards. It's now or never.

This is the exact right time for queers all over the world to fight for the cause again. USA is against lgbt people again so theocratic extremists can't accuse us of being funded by USA and meanwhile the theocratic extremists themselves are at a shaky position due to losing their foreign funding— this is the exact right time to hit.

On bigotry:

Bigotry isn't a result of genuine hatred nor genuine fear— nor genuine ignorance. It's a political exercise in dominance and control.

The reason Bangladeshi lgbt activists can not make progress is because they fail to recognise this and point their focus instead on appealing to people's humanity rather than approaching it like any other war or conflict of interest. You can't get

queer rights by "educating" people. The problem isn't a lack of "education" or "narrow mindedness". It's a matter of dominance. You can only get your rights through asserting dominance in return, by making it so that fucking with your community and keeping it downtrodden simply is not beneficial enough for your oppressors when the cost they have to pay is compared.

To beg for humanity from conservatives is an inherent act of submission, and you can not defeat constructs of dominance with submission.

Bigotry exists because the ruling class needs a scapegoat every time something goes wrong. To blame someone for systemic and economical failures. To blame someone for it when they fail to properly respond to natural disasters.

It gives the powerless white and blue collar working class majority a false sense of station above the powerless working class minority by oppressing them and thus redirect their negative attention away from the ruling class.

It creates a more easily exploitable community (slavery of races, marginalized people and women being paid less, sexual exploitation of trans people etc).

Bigotry helps normalize the idea of hierarchies, it makes social hierarchies seem as normal as the air you breathe, the fight against this will inevitably lead to fight against the exploitation of the working class by the capitalists.

Bigotry exists because it benefits someone somewhere. Bigotry doesn't exist because of culture or religion. There are plenty religious explanations and fatwas that reconcile Islam with acceptance of lgbt people and explain that Sodom and Gomorrah was destroyed due to rape rather than sodomy. If theocrats wanted to, they could've accepted that explanation, but they make the conscious decision to be bigoted instead. Bigotry exists due to exploitative economies. It benefits the ruling class, they use their institutions and platforms to spread bigotry. And it won't go away slowly in due time on its own if you don't fight against conservatives and capitalists.

The hijra people are not disallowed from integrating into society and forced into ghettos because they fundamentally hate hijra people, but rather because it's easier to human traffic those in destitute.

"They hate what they fear" Wrong! They hate what they can benefit from hating, they systematically kill what they benefit from killing.

You can't stamp out someone's bigotry when it's not born out of ignorance but rather born out of performance, the desire to be communally cherished through the mutual interest in hating the same things.

There's a different kind of horror in being targeted by someone who neither fears nor hates you, but sees you as the collateral damage in their entertaining bonding session with friends.

This is why when they suffer any consequences for their bigotry, they are taken back. Because it was supposed to be fun, and suddenly it's not fun anymore.
The reason queer terrorism is necessary in combating bigotry is because it makes their benefit from bigotry insignificant compared to their loss from bigotry. There is no genuine belief among most bigots beyond an imitation of opinion. Great violence is needed to purify them either to feel genuine hatred or to give up the pretension.

One of the psychological aspects contributing to anti-queer bigotry is the existential fear of not leaving behind replicas of oneself, as in producing no children.
That's why a lot of conservative parents are fine with their sons and daughters secretly fucking troonies and faggots and dykes but are not fine with them spending their lives with those lgbts. "Do what you want behind closed doors, but don't settle with the one you love." Because children are viewed as an extension of oneself, this view plays into viewing one's queer children as people who are murdering one's extended self by choosing not to give one grandchildren.
The point to queer terrorism is kind of disregarding these cishet fearful feelings of their queer children not leaving genetic replicas and etc. Because the intensity of that fear pales in comparison to the intensity of my pain at not having my rights for

marriage to a man and settling down with a man. I won't call the fear of your children who are your genetic replicas not leaving behind genetic replicas of themselves either rational or irrational. It doesn't matter whether your fear is valid or invalid. Because at the end, you can abuse your children and try to brainwash them into making grandchildren. But for those of us who cannot be brainwashed through abuse, we must have the option to settle and marry. Otherwise we kill you and your replicas. And so the fear is made insignificant through violence. You know how a lot of homophobes say that troonfaggi-ness should just be a private matter rather than being legally recognized?

I guess my approach to queerphobia is that it's tolerable to make queerphobia a private matter instead of legalizing it or maintaining its legalization. So if you think you can brainwash or conversion-therapy your kids into not being queer and they accept it — I wouldn't really particularly care for those chumps. As long as those who reject it have the option to settle and marry those of the same chromosomes. Otherwise, without that option, well, you get my fires and you get my brimstones.

Bigots don't hate or fear the marginalized. They hate and fear the idea of losing their foothold in the pyramid of social hierarchy. See, women are the property of men in relationships. This makes the man feel like a king, yes? He rules his woman. And thus his drive for rulership fulfilled, he feels a sense of brotherhood to the ruler of his workplace and the ruler of his nation. Thus he is obedient to the rules and regulations of state and capital that exploits him because he can in turn exploit the woman subservient to him. To misuse a Rabindranath line, "we are all kings in the kingdom of kings, why else would we go along with the king?"

But bigots fear that lgbts would present a contradiction to this model. Because if a man is the property owner and a woman is the property, then a man and a man in a relationship would mean a property owner owning another property owner. A woman and another woman in a relationship would mean a property owning another property. How can a thing own a thing? How can a slave own a slave? And how can a master own a master?

And what of transgenders? How can a master become a slave? How can a slave become a master?

Lgbts present in the framework of bigots an upwards and downwards social mobility which the bigot must resist again. Because he finds more security at the

peak of his pyramid if the pyramid stays stable. In his mind lgbts are an earthquake.
This of course does not represent reality. Transgender women and most overtly feminine gay men are subjugated and relegated to a hierarchy below cis woman in the real world because even if they don't expressly state their identity, their behaviour or innate personality traits often spells it out and the society punishes them for their divergence.
Even if lgbt people were legalized the pyramid of hierarchy for bigots would remain stable and merely re-adjust itself a little to accommodate to the modifications.
Regardless this is a discussion of what the bigots fear would happen. They must neutralize a threat to their hierarchy if there is an iota of chance for destabilization.
But this presentation ignores that oppression against lgbt people does not exist solely to keep women in line subjugated to men and to keep the men in line subjugated to state and capital but also to create another exploitable underclass out of lgbts. What's the effect of being relegated to the status below women's status as property on lgbts? Well—

The Purpose of the Current System:

The purpose of a system is what it does is a concept created by Stafford Beer which posits that it does not matter what the system's creator says its function is on paper. What matters is what the system does in reality. If a system functions in a way that detracts from the purpose that is stated on paper, then the system is not malfunctioning, it is simply working as intended.
Sorowar the noted lgbt-phobe of Bangladesh so said regarding a gay man, he cares not on a personal level who sleeps with whom. Someone else chimed in, declaring so that of course theology does not care either, there is required at least four witnesses according to theology to convict someone with the act of sodomy. Which would so be lacking in most cases.
Mask off.
So we arrive at the question, why do anti-lgbt laws exist if the purpose is not to stop lgbt sex?

There are countless homosexual male prostitutes in Bangladesh and all over the world too who had to rely on that profession because they were too obviously gay to be in the closet and to ever get education due to bullying from classmates and later had no jobs etc.
Homophobia is not effective in making sodomy extinct. No. What is it effective in? It's effective in creating lgbt prostitutes who die before growing old due to lack of stable work access/hospital care due to institutional bigotry. You can't even get on life support without familial and spousal consent.
Queerphobes say that Sodom and Gomorrah's destruction happened due to homosexuality (although there is argument and fatwas that it happened due to rape, not homosexuality, theocrats have the option to choose the lgbt-friendly fatwas from Islamic scholars like Imam Muhsin or Samar Habib, but they don't, they reject attempts at reconciling faith with lgbt people, so lgbtphobia is not really about faith is it?) but regardless. Punishment of homosexuality, illegalization of homosexuality isn't actually stopping homosexual acts. What it's doing is creating a supply chain of young homosexual and transgender prostitutes for rich people to exploit. Rich people can just build their cishet family while exploiting and abusing these prostitutes for pennies. So if you think sodom and gomorrah happened due to homosexual acts, fine, but it didn't happen due to homosexual marriage. Sodom and Gomorrah didn't allow lgbts to marry.
So why the fuck do you think natural disasters wouldn't happen in a society without lgbt rights where rich people abuse and fuck lower class lgbt prostitutes anyway?
Because that rhetoric exists not to stop sodomy, but to stop lgbt people from having stability. The purpose of this system *is* to create a higher number of lgbt prostitutes who die off early.
Have you noticed how right wingers like Sorowar and left wingers who posit that "lgbts can exist but shouldn't seek marriage rights because it's a product of capitalism yadda yadda" agree on one thing? It doesn't matter whom you screw, you just don't get to live with them. Your purpose is to make children who can be workers and soldiers for the state and capital, so the state and capital can pay a workforce desperate for jobs (the workforce which supply exceeds the demand) as little as possible. So they create a system in which homosexual romantic relationships are nipped at the bud. They want to incentivize a dynamic in which people treat homoromance as an early life indulgence and move away from it to

build a family. And hey, if you still feel the inclination to fuck a tranny or a fag in your middle ages, there will always be the young supply of visibly queer child prostitutes thrown out of their homes due to social taboo and you won't need to attach feelings or need to commit to any of them because the insecure and violent nature of the profession they've been funneled into will ensure their early death due to lack of food, shelter and medical care.
Deny a group of people marriage rights or illegalize them altogether.
Due to criminalization and lack of institutional protection and recognition resulting in no socially engineered regulation they develop a culture stereotyped by fleeting polygamous relationships.
As a result diseases spread by intimacy spreads faster among them.
You can now use their plight to further demonize them and undo their activism.
A lot of people say "I wish homophobic conservative politicians had gay children" but you see, it doesn't matter. Because in the packing order they've built, their gay kids will grow up to be married people who fuck queer prostitutes in secret for pittance every once in a while, and dispose their abused bodies like garbage. You see, there is no hypocrisy in a conservative homophobic man fucking other men. Because homosexuality is a social status indicating one's low worth. And people with access to sufficient wealth can transcend that low social status, they can spend their lives in the closet while abusing gay people who are less fortunate. For them homosexuality must be constrained into the base sexual act. Nothing akin to love must be allowed to blossom because love would mean coexisting with this person and that'd be one less childbirth, one less future worker or soldier to feed into the machine.
To be out of the closet? To actually treat homosexuality as something that demands marriage rights? To see your partner as an actual human? That's unacceptable. You see, that is why Muntasir must not be allowed into the political party. How dare he not stay closeted and still dream of engaging with politics? Because the role of those who are visibly queer and out of the closet, in this system which is functioning exactly as intended, is to be prostitutes and concubines. Muntasir is not supposed to be in front of a news channel's camera, Muntasir is not supposed to stand in the spotlight, he must be relegated under street light, to be exploited and disposed of. To live in ghettos built by liberals for visible lgbt people and die from diseases and hunger.

There's a reason the Bangladeshi middle class loves making jokes about ladyboy prostitutes in Thailand but acts aghast when they get the actual rights and legal recognition that can help them to settle down and marry and move away from a highly risky profession.

There are enough powerful and rich men in Bangladesh who go after trans women lol. If they wanted to actually fix things and make life less hellish for trans people, they would already have done so. But it's much more beneficial to them to keep queerphobia alive so that the supply line of young and desperate queer people whom the systems failed trying to survive by any means necessary - who don't ask for anything beyond money for food and shelter in return for "relationships"- keeps flowing.

They had their fatwas, they had their queer friendly interpretations of quran and hadiths. The reason they will not accept these explanations isn't because they hate queers from their core, but rather because they want to keep queers within a low station of society. The few of us they kill is just a sacrifice to the altar of that station but really they'd rather not deal with the blood as long as we're obedient.

Reiterating my point once more, there has been a recent research that found the right wing conservative American states with the most amount of anti-transgender laws also have the most amount of searches for transgender pornography. A lot of people found this funny or hypocritical. But really, there is no hypocrisy in this. What is the consequence of anti-transgender laws? The transgender kids get thrown out of home, they can't access education without bullying, they can't get jobs. What's the consequence of that? They turn to prostitution, becoming porn actors, and concubinism. So really, conservatives are simply maintaining their supply chain of vulnerable trans people to abuse. The purpose of a system is what it does, and this is the system they've built.

Like I always say, right wingers don't want to eradicate trans people completely, just like they don't want to eradicate cis women or black people. They want trans people in the lower station in the pyramid of hierarchy. They want trans people to live as sex objects without any legal recognition of marriage or institutional recognition and die after being abused and exploited.

Eradicating cis women, black people, and trans people would mean right wingers can not exploit them any longer, right wingers just want to deny them legal rights to keep exploiting them. And that's worse.

None of the things I've said about the purpose of the current system is speculative. This applies not simply in Bangladesh — look up queer biographies in the AIDS era or talk with any older queer who lived at least thirty years prior to lgbt marriage rights being legalized in America+UK. Talk with queer people from African, Asian, European countries that don't have marriage rights now— it's the same fucking shit, lack of marriage rights makes whores and concubines and porn stars out of lgbt people, often before they reach 18 for survival after being disowned and thrown out, and kills them early. The purpose of the system isn't your extermination. It’s making you disposable and exploitable. That's what scares me so much. That's what makes me care about this community and identity and the legal rights. Because extermination is not sustainable, I would prefer attempts at extermination because heightened repression would result in rebellion. But their goal is not extermination. Extermination does not benefit them. Their goal is exploitation. And that? If the entire feudal era to present day is anything to go by? That's sustainable. And that scares the shit out of me. Not queers getting gathered and brush fired into oblivion, that'd be over in seconds. But a hundred more years of disowned queer children sexually abused by the very politicians who passed laws to socially engineer them into destitute. It scares the fucking shit out me, man. Understanding this truth is like looking into the eyes of an eldritch monster. The thought in my head is heavy and remains like an object of weight that has penetrated my skull physically.

Here's a Joke for You

A man dying from thirst was crawling through the desert in search of water. The lack of it was killing him. Eventually he came upon a well guarded by a man well-hydrated.
He begged the well-hydrated man to let him drink from the well, but as he died from thirst the well-hydrated man denying him the water said: “Water is not life, water is only one aspect of life. In an ideal world, you’d be given plenty food every day to eat too.”

On the False “Backwards Masses” Claim:

When it comes to human rights in a national scale, the masses do simply what the ruling class tells them to do. The ruling class here includes rich people who may not have their political party in power but have wealth enough to affect change that benefits them.
Things like legalized underage marriage, marital rape etc could be largely decreased if the ruling class gave a shit instead of benefiting from it.
Bangladeshis as a whole aren't inherently backwards than any other place in the world, the problem is not with the masses just trying to live their lives. The problem is with ruling class people who say dumb shit like "Of course I'm personally against these things. But the masses don't agree, and I'm but a slave to the masses." They're lying. They want the status quo to be what it is.
The Bangladeshi "masses" are just the scapegoat the ruling class uses to claim progress isn't possible. This concept is called selective populism. And Eco was right, television and internet did make it worse and transformed it into a grotesque tumored monster eating and flinging its own regurgitated shit.
Bangu left acts like all right wing/social problems in BD would be solved if the country was richer as if rich countries don't deal with the same stuff. Like we're supposed to up and die till we hit a certain level of economic growth.
This is because the only liberal/left minded people they know are from their economic circle too. Because they don't know anyone outside their economic circle.
So rich = liberal, conservative = the masses, in their mind. So if you want civil rights, they'll say you're classist hahahahahaha.
There are over ২০ কোটি people in this country, the ruling will point at a handful of paid gatherings to claim "the masses are too uneducated to want progress". It's fucking bullshit.
Do not trust anyone who preaches shallow falsehoods about "the masses not being ready" for your rights. More than half the mob violence and killings in Bangladesh are paid for by capitalists. Those people do not represent the masses.
The thing about "material conditions affecting social positions" is that it's not necessarily saying "poor people have socially conservative views" - although the phrase gets used to mean that way a lot by dumbfuck libs, which is wrong because a lot of poor people are fairly socially liberal, more liberal than rich and middle class people by ratio- it's saying rich and middle class people have socially

conservative views because they have a material incentive to protect their status quo and ensure society is stratified into hierarchies.
It's not the poor people making legal choices that are fucking over minorities or writing intellecuck articles about "the transgender problem" and riling other middle class people up into attacking them and then acting like it happened because the proletariat are just too angry due to the misery inflicted upon them.
I must explain something to my white friends about the third world:
Here, most mobs are never formed by average people. The average people under fear merely acquiesce, not participate.
They're funded and organized by politicians, corporations (who move in on the land after the destruction of minority homes have been done), the state and military — mostly intersecting. So you see a transgender slum get destroyed, a gay man killed — and your first instinct is to forget the same thing happens in your land and your second instinct is to think of the people in the landmass are like this and that.
But know, these aren't average people, these are the equivalent of your neo-nazis in the garbs of average people — framed as average people, potentially even "subaltern" by some corrupt intellectuals.
And now that your white guilt has been activated — do not beat yourself up over it— this thought process is embraced by brown liberals and leftists here too— who go on to say "See all of this violence? Queer rights are impossible."

Just decriminalization Won't be Enough, Need for Legal Recognition and Legal Marriage Rights:

Decriminalizing lgbts without giving them marriage rights is like stabbing someone and expecting a thank you for getting the knife out without bandaging them up. The wound is still there and the blood is still pouring out and that person will still die.

Your pain is the 2 that shall be addressed after counting their 1, but brother, they're starting from negative infinity and they never intend to go there.

Kwame Ture had once said "If a white man wants to lynch me, that's his problem. If he's got the power to lynch me, that's my problem."

You see, queerphobia isn’t a question of attitude, queerphobic attitudes can be dismantled by queers at an individual level around the people they coexist with. But it won't matter as long as laws keep fucking them over. My goal is changing transphobic and homophobic laws, I don't give a fuck if you want to kill me on a personal level.

Why legalization? Moreover why marriage rights?

Liberals crow on about recognizing queer people as humans or the necessity of social acceptance, insisting that “legalization isn't liberation”. But societal acceptance without legal recognition is meaningless. The easiest way to refute a liberal who thinks legal protections and rights don't matter as much as "social acceptance" is to amputate its limbs or kill it.

Laws impact people’s morals and create social acceptance rather than the other way around. Social acceptance is a vague and undefined thing.

The problem with a lot of Bangladeshi liberals’ conception of queerphobia is that it's mired within the spectrum of- from “getting ugly looks and slur words” to “physical violence.”

You can ignore ugly looks from the passersby, you can ignore slurs and callings of names, in a violent situation you can win if you are good enough at fighting.

The lack of systemic legal recognition of marriage for queer people decreases their chance of survival significantly more than any individual acts of bigotry against them.

The method of survival in Bangladesh is designed around families. Children are seen as a form of investment into the future of the parents. Marriage is a form of investment into accessing connections and networking and social capital if not outright actual capital for the whole family.

If you can't marry then you become an unworthy project to invest into the survival of in the eyes of your family.

Do you think as many hijra kids would get thrown out of home and die homeless if their marriage was legal in Bangladesh and thus their families had an incentive to keep them and actually raise them with the educational resources that would translate into job security?

Thus, without marriage rights for them when they grow up, ensuring the survival of children who appear as potentially queer and recognised as unable to bring in that future benefit are recognized as sunk cost by their families. They are at first mistreated with the hope of changing them, and then thrown out of home.

If queer marriage was legal, families would have an incentive to keep their queer children and support them, increasing the likelihood that the children would receive educational resources leading to job security.

What happens to coins in a capitalist system which value has been nulled by the state? They get thrown away with the exceptions of a handful of collectors

Most visibly queer people without the luxury of having a choice to be closeted don't have their mother's side of the family or the father's side of the family as connections. They don't have their own family to have connection with. And they can not build a family of their own.

It's worse for trans people because homosexual couples can claim to be roommates and spend their lives taking care of one another inside the closet. But as trans people to alleviate dysphoria are compelled to be out of closet, their partner cannot claim to be a mere roommate.

A mutually secretive gay male or lesbian female couple can pay each other visits in the hospital without destroying their closet but the chances of a cis man partner visiting his trans woman girlfriend — or a cis woman visiting her trans man boyfriend — in the hospital without being scared of being recognized as a tranny-lover is significantly lower. Thus trans people receive lesser care when they become ill or are wounded.

Even the most physically and intellectually capable of queers are human. Human bodies break down. Human minds break down. And they need recovery periods when humans lean on other humans. But when laws keep you from forming human connections, when you have no family, no matter how self-sufficient you are, one day you will roll over and fall on the bathroom floor and no one will be around to pick you up.

This is how hijra communes came to be formed. It's visibly queer people taking care of each other because their significant others won't. It does not sing glory of an accepting culture, it's a life support system that barely even works.

Even those communes, due to being sequestered into ghettos rather than integrated within society are attacked again and again, the bricks of their shelters come undone with each new social upheaval.

And even then, what happens when a community has to pay higher-than-average rent to be allowed even in a slum, and they're not given education and jobs, and they have to resort to begging and at the end prostitution - and prostitution pays more for the children - and there are so many children thrown or abused out of family and home due to the state's devaluing of them?

You know exactly what fucking happens.

The moronic liberals claim that laws come later, fixing of hearts must come first, but hearts in truth beat to the rhythm of laws.

Real life anecdote of laws affecting survival:
A trans man died from a gas explosion. Doctors delayed his life support, due to lack of family consent. Delayed it asking what his gender is due to his appearance as male not matching his NID card which stated he was female. Family members didn’t want to claim him. Later his friends had to bribe the police to even bury him, because even burials need familial consent. And he had no marriage rights in Bangladesh to build his family.

A person who vocally supports and fights for helpful/anti-discriminatory legal policies for marginalized communities even if they have an intrinsic distaste for that community is a far better and useful human being than a person who doesn't believe in the necessity of legal/systemic change for said marginalized community but thinks they're somehow purified or absolved or made more humane by their friendliness or feeling of love/compassion for said community — a performance of humanity ritually exercised by being a tourist.
A lot of Bangladeshi liberal attitudes toward lgbt people would work 1) either if the person in question was rich and could bribe their way through life 2) or if it was a less systemic and less organized society.

As in rhetorics such as "Why can't you just be lgbt without systemic or legal recognition?" If everyone had their own land they lived off of and a house in a place with less population density and didn't need to operate or have ties within institutions sure, why not.

But life doesn't work like that. Everything from banks to hospitals to apartments-to-be-rented etc requires information about and incentivises you to have a spouse and a family.

Most people don't have their own land or house they can just spend the rest of their lives with their non-cishet partner in, rented apartments are hard to manage especially so if either of them are visibly queer.

"Minding your business and keeping to yourself" doesn't work when legal papers screw you over. You can't keep to yourself in this world.

And this devaluation of legal recognition would work if it came from someone who was part of an armed revolutionary militia actively giving the middle finger to state and capital. Not some milquetoast dumbfuck academia prick who is either a married cishet with children or a cis bi and can afford the resources to maintain

their closet without significantly hampering their life — one who has the rights to marry and build their own family.

Bangladeshi liberals and leftists frame being lgbt as a thing one does rather than an aspect of who one is. And this allows them to treat lgbtphobia, criminalisation and lack of marriage rights as rather than an impediment of lgbt people on an existential level— instead a block on "acts" of "luxury".

This framing allows them to frame us as inherently decadent, consumerist and even, with enough rhetorical stretching, bourgeoisie. These people are the reason why bombs become the ultimate answer rather than peaceful political solutions. Long may the flesh char — and deep may reach its burn.

That's why I have the urge to separate these people's legally recognised family members from themselves and the mortal coil, you don't get to tell people that what they don't have doesn't matter when you have it yourself.

Because ultimately they don't conceive relationships of Others as something that goes beyond sex and involves actual cohabitation and domestic life, being around the person who holds your heart.

Also, any queer who is against getting marriage rights is an upper class one who wants the ability to keep exploiting queers of lower classes who can't supplement their lack of access to social institutions with wealth. Thus any queer who doesn't want marriage rights is my enemy. Because my demand isn't identity politics, it doesn't matter what the identity of my friend or foe is, it's a matter of civil rights. Faggots or dykes who've had the snot beaten out of them by their family and are now about to marry someone of the opposite gender are like "Modern society and culture places too much value on individualistic romantic love. But the love of family and community is more important." Lmfao. If the community won't allow my love for people of the same chromosomes to be legally recognized, I'll simply snuff them out.

I don't think — if legal marriage rights are achieved for Bangladeshi lgbt people after decades of bloodshed and sacrifice — that queer liberation would be

achieved. My goal is not liberation or full social acceptance — that is impossible without socialism. I see marriage rights rather as the bare minimum, I see marriage rights as the Oxygen mask in a world polluted to the point of becoming unbreathable where the masses are chained and shackled into slavery. The point of seeking marriage rights isn't freedom, I see marriage rights as the whiffs of oxygen for queer people to ensure their survival so they can work on breaking their shackles and the shackles of all rather than suffocating to death. Marriage rights *is* the compromise. And I want it. Because fuck you, give me what you've got for yourself.

Queer "liberation" is a meaningless buzzword.

"Social acceptance" is a meaningless buzzword.

Demand same-gender marriage rights.

Bigotry will forever exist, you will always hear slurs. You will often need to fight physically. This is unavoidable. The point of legal rights is to give you the slightest chance of survival. Of course it won't solve all your problems. Of course your parents won't say they'll love you forever no matter what like some cheesy Hollywood movie. The point of legal rights is to give you a lifeline to hold as you drown, of course it's not a magical solution to all of your problems. But it needs to exist just for that.

Realistically, most of our generation will never own a house or land.

That kind of "You can't watch cartoons and movies because they're satanic" or "you can't go to majars" or "you can't enjoy festivals of other religions" or "You can't date someone of the same gender or change your gender" type of shit would work only with a populace that has anything to lose.

But other than entertainment and having people you love and care about - most of us don't have anything going on in our lives to really give a shit about maintaining some sort of puritan lifestyle in the fear of "losing what we have" because we have literally nothing.

So you can't take fun and romantic connections where anyone actually feels anything away from life and expect people with the last things keeping them sane to continue to function.

Bangladesh has more rights for alcohol than it does for lgbt people. Right wingers are more against the marriage rights of my people than they are for addictive substances. This country can have alcohol so drunk men can beat their wives and children but not the rights and social security for my people. What a joke. Waak

thooo. These ruling class schmucks get to drink and while away their lives while preventing us from the institutional and legal recognition and slowly fucking kill us through criminalization and systemic barriers. And they call *us* the hedonists? Naaah. I'm gonna drown these motherfuckers in their alcohol, I'll light their houses in fire with it.

On “Private Life”-ization of LGBT Issues

One's orientation or who one loves is not merely a private matter. It's a social matter. It's a legal matter. You don't love someone in just a private setting, you exist with that person in a society.
To act like lgbt people's relationships are constrained within the setting of the bed is incredibly dehumanizing. It's not. We need legalization of our relationships, we need legal recognition of our relationships realized as marriages, we need the ability to give legal consent to bury our loved ones, to have the legal ability to consent to their surgeries and putting them on life support when they can't give it themselves.
We are not creatures of sex and perversion. We are not hedonists whose existence is centered around fucking. We are people who want to build relationships and families with each other.

Your Mom is a Bourgeois Construct

The honest to god truth is I couldn't give less of a fucking shit about the GDP of Bangladesh when I can't legally marry a man. This doesn't mean I'm rejecting economical or material analysis — I'm only rejecting care for macroeconomics— but the lack of marriage rights for me falls under the category of microeconomics because marriage has economic angles. Now when the "love is love" queers ask for marriage rights, retarded leftist cunts inform them "but marriage is a bourgeoisie creation" or "sexuality doesn't exist, it's all just labels"— which is as fuckturded a claim as saying "labor unions exist under capitalism so labor unions are a bourgeoisie creation". The point is I do not care about moralizing my demand for marriage rights — I want them because it would improve my economic and medical situation — because you have it, and if you deny me what you take for yourself then I shall take from you your life.

Why are we supposed to be perfect creatures who subsist by eating moonlight? Why must we exist under state and capitalism but accept being denied the things state and capitalism allows heterosexuals? This is not a matter of "love winning", it's a matter of you not giving me what you have and me fucking taking it from you no matter how many bodies I gotta drop for it.
Shaming queers for wanting marriage rights instead of marriage abolition is like blaming the slave for wanting to be recognized as a free citizen instead of seeking to destroy the state for a stateless society.

Assimilation is Good

Imagine after civil war if the newly-freed-from-direct-slavery black people seeking to gain property rights or voting rights were condemned as "assimilationists" by anarchists and "bourgeoisie" by marxists. I seek legal lgbt marriage rights through illegal violence because the consequence otherwise is the slow systemic death of my people— and I see no contradiction in this.
Hell, we assimilate by existing. Existence isn't resistance.
The closeted rich queer conservative politician is as much of an assimilationist as is the loudly queer transsexual whore he abuses. Because they're both within their station of society as is determined acceptable by the status quo. To seek marriage rights which would result in social mobility for queers then is in a way anti-assimilationist.

Rent

Do you know why charities and ngos, even when people at the top weren’t swindling the money for themselves — never substantially improved transgender lives? In the context of Bangladesh where most trans people are funneled into slums and ghettos without marriage rights as prostitutes denied family having to rely on each other to survive? A vulnerable community specifically isolated into a patch of housing environment? Let's say you're a slum lord. And these trans people suddenly get money from charities. You as a slum landlord are not going to let them spend it on themselves. You're going to raise the fucking rent. And it's easy for you to raise the rent specifically for trans people rather than both trans and cis people because the trans people are all huddled into the same living environment.

So you see how it is? A community gets specifically targeted charity but it doesn't do jack because the community is isolated and converged into the same space rather than being allowed to assimilate into society through institutions like marriage. And so the transgender whore still ends up having to sell its body for rent and food, because the house always wins.

Dire Wolves, LGBTs, How Pleasure Works for the Rich, Artificial Scarcity and Artificial Supply

The more near-extinct and hunted to rarity an animal is, the higher is its value as a pet, food or mantelpiece to the ruling class. The relation of the ruling class with the repression of lgbt people works in a similar way.
The more suffering is behind an object the more is its value to the ruling class — natural diamonds mined with child slave labor is desirable to them precisely because the suffering is the point. The ruling class' relationship with lgbt prostitutes works in a similar way.
The suffering of lower class lgbt people is what makes them appealing to exploit to the ruling class. The low population of lgbt people after being hate crimed, illegalized and passively murdered by denying their engagement in legal system and institutions is precisely the exoticism that makes lower class lgbt appealing to the ruling class who sexually exploits them. Artificial scarcity. If the ruling class didn't need women and men to have intercourse to breed workers and soldiers — they would illegalize women as well, just to extract the pleasure of women's rarity and suffering.
I've spoken before how hate crimes of lgbt people exist not to wipe us out but to make us scared of wanting our legal rights— to keep the living ones in their low station perpetually exploited. But every once in a while for a performance of morality when the right wing kills off large parts of the lgbt population — like the beheading and executions of transgender leaders and communities at the hands of Islamic New Order in Indonesia — what happens when they go overboard with their artificial scarcity and destroy the supply chain of prostitutes all together? Why, when artificial scarcity goes out of hand and destroys their supply, they simply create artificial supply. So when once there were people who were homosexual and transgender and just wanted to live peaceful lives with their partners but were forced into prostitution instead for survival through the denial of

their civil rights and access to institutions — they're murdered off and the demand for lgbt prostitutes for the ruling class to exploit is supplemented by straight children from poor families who sell them to the rich being forced to engage in sodomy or crossdressing (like bachabazi, ghetuputra tradition etc). And this sexual violence later is used to demonize lgbt people as inherently "wrong" — further helping the rich create an artificial scarcity of lgbt people by demonizing lgbt people and further satiating their pleasure in the suffering of others by creating an artificial supply if they ever go overboard with killing off lgbts.

Why Are So Many Trans Women Actual Whores

Mfs be like "noo trannies and fags don't deserve marriage rights like normal people"
Okay, but I'm not gonna just fall and die without rights.
The likelihood is, without marriage rights I'll just become a concubine or a kept boy or a sugar baby to a rich dude — because men who are in my socioeconomical sphere wouldn't be able to live together with me long term because they're scared of social backlash and meanwhile rich people can afford secrecy — so if I want to have a consistent partner I can rely on for unforseen circumstances (as elaborated later) I'll naturally gravitate to a sugar-baby type dynamic — without any of the actual legal security or framework of family as a backup for me that exists in marriages.
So like what's the point? If I had marriage rights I could go for a regular relationship with a regular dynamic in which the distribution of power is the same and we materially take care of each other. But without legal rights society is being engineered for me to gravitate toward relationships with a lopsided power dynamics.
To elaborate here's an excerpt I wrote in the past:
This isn't about me.
But there's this really funny phenomenon I've been noticing where financially lower class guys ask out lower class trans women in a date and then get really offended when the trans woman is frank about only dating rich guys.
Because when it comes to trans women being "gold diggers" - you guys are sort of creating the situation where being a gold digger is the only option for most trans

women because you're certainly not gonna date them without keeping them a secret.
If you can't face potential social alienation by openly dating them "for love", why should they not care about your wealth or lack thereof "for love"?
The kind of relationship dynamic cis men want with trans women- as in, keeping them secret- is really only possible if they were super rich (which they aren't lol) because at least part of the point of relationships is building connection and strengthening social security (and of course single people can focus more on themselves and thus are better off without a relationship that doesn't offer them any semblance of security) and if you keep someone secret you obviously can not help them out when they're in a pickle -like if they get hospitalized or if they face threats or if they lose their job or their landlord throws them out- you're not gonna be able to give them shelter if you keep them secret lol- that is unless you're obscenely rich and can afford to have those things handled from the background because you have the resources.
So like you can't call a trans woman "gold digger" for not dating you when you were gonna treat her like an embarrassing disposable secret if she did date you lol.
So the intent of these anti-lgbt laws or lack of legal rights, which prevents people from having healthy non-secretive relationships, aren't to actually kill us, or even stop our relationships, but engineering us as an exploitable consumable product of rich people.
Do you get my point? Do you see?

Fuck You, Give Me What You Have

The fight for legal lgbt rights is not the fight for "free love". I don't give a shit about "free love". I'm monogamous, I want my legally recognized husband to have the legal rights to give consent to my medical surgery if I get into an accident and vice versa. I want him to have the legal rights to visit me at hospital when I'm in my deathbed and vice versa. I want to be able to stay in a rented apartment with him. I want him to have legal rights to give consent to my burial when I die and vice versa. I want him to have the legal rights to get the wages I earnt and have in my bank when I die.
"Free love" is something people can perform without needing legal recognition.

The point of fighting for legal lgbt rights is to prevent our systemic deaths. It's not conceptual or theoretical. It's not revolutionary. It's not fluffy. It's not an utopian Ideal. It's the most basic shit possible.
It's not a fucking "bourgeoisie ideal" to want to live. To want your partner to have certain rights as mentioned in regards to you. Just decriminalizing our existence isn't enough. We need legal marriage or civil union rights.

Lighten Up

Let me tell you a joke: the slaves of a kingdom break their chains and uprise against the slavers and owners. Their castles stormed and set on fire, with the Bell of their death ringing, the ruling class now brought to their knees prepares new baits to their Hooks and thus declares: "This unchained desire for agency is so bougie-normative of you, you whose culture was once pure in suffering now impure —yourselves so unfettered. We as a society assign too much value to freedom from slavery. But freedom from having too much leisure without knowing what to do, freedom from the burden of rulership and all the responsibilities that come with it is also equally important. Besides, am I not too a slave? Slave — as in not merely a class (though that can be a dimension of it) — but slave, as in being subservient to the natural order of hierarchies. Sure, you want to dismantle the slavery which affects you personally, but do you also have plans to dismantle all other inequality and hierarchies of the world? Being free of slavery but maintaining other hierarchies, would you not validate the social order all the more? Are you not then self-serving individualists with no care for the greater collective of civilians who thrive off the labor of the underclass that is you?"
And upon hearing this the slaves, guilt-ridden, forsake the weapons of their hands and accept the bondage of shackles and whips once more awaiting the day for all hierarchies to be destroyed before they destroy the one they're trapped beneath. And everyone, the slaves and the slavers, proceed to COEXIST in COMMUNAL HARMONY and PEACE forever thereafter.

Beware the Vultures of Sorrow

Liberals preach on about their empathy, they've turned empathy into a weapon — not against oppressors but against the oppressed. Their opposition to homophobia

and transphobia is a controlled opposition. They will say you too deserve empathy, that you too are human, that they feel sorrow at your plight — but they're the vultures of sorrow. Their sorrow exists only to assert their humanity, but does not transmute into legal change. Their intention is not legal change nor doing any actual improvement beyond charity for lgbt people— it is to maintain the conditions which creates the necessity for charity. Their empathy is a jackboot.

I'm Not a SWERF

Swerf stands for sex worker exclusionary radical feminist. Am not against sex workers, I am against their clients- and the concept of sex work under capitalism where the basic needs of all humans being met is not guaranteed. If work is slavery under capitalism (or any exploitative economy prior to capitalism), sex work is by that logic sexual slavery.
And that's ignoring even the fact that most "sex workers" are really victims of sexual trafficking who can't get out of it even if they tried or were introduced to it as homeless children and now lack the skills or education people of their age would've developed otherwise if given access to educational resources and shit and so can't do anything else to survive. And even when they're not victims of sexual trafficking, it's a highly dangerous profession that tends to traumatize them because clients who are paying for the service often tend to ignore consent violently.
There's a reason most prostitutes are rape victims who were scandalized into being homeless, or abused queer kids who got thrown out of home, mentally ill or neurodivergent people or just real poor people. Their profession springs from the seeds of trauma, and bears fruits of further trauma. And that shit applies to 'first world" countries too, not just in Bangladesh.
The problem with a lot of swerfs is that they veer into judging or hating the sex workers - or they portray them as being "guilty" of being complicit in the subjugation of women (although a large chunk of the prostitutes are queer men too)- when they're just trying to survive in a reality where they don't have any alternatives that doesn’t worsen their conditions.
Now this attitude just leads to punitive action against sex workers or taboofying them from occupying institutional spaces- and when that happens - the only thing

that's going to lead to is pushing them further into sex work by reducing their access to alternative methods of survival even more.

You can say catchy slogans like from that Poor Things movie like "sex workers own their means of production because it's their body" but they don't really, even if they're not controlled by a pimp - the places where they solicit will take a cut from their earnings due to rent and shit. The means of production is not merely their body, but also the places where they solicit and engage in the service.

So yeah that's where I stand. I think most swerfs are punitive puritans who don't care about prostitutes' well being as fellow humans - and I think liberals who act like sex work is libratory are bullshitting themselves - and that most prostitutes would be given free therapy and basic needs without needing to do labor for at least half a decade in a non-capitalist utopia (realistically, you can't take someone who has heavily been traumatized and plop them into another arduous job and expect them to function as well at it without relapsing. You gotta give them time to heal and get their shit together and that's a care which systems under capitalism tend to lack) - but unfortunately due to existing social attitudes they will probably be butchered in droves during times of social upheavals.

Yin and Yang

One of my acquaintances went to do charity work for prostitutes with his male friend, and the women (biological cis women who were born as women, for the sake of clarity) gang-raped that man and robbed him of his money. While he yelled for help they told him "What did you think would happen when you visited whores like us?"

Does this incur disgust in you against prostitutes? Maybe view them as demented creatures? Of perversion?

Think of it this way: if prostitutes get help from charity — they stop being so vulnerable. Who benefits from the vulnerability of prostitutes? Why, pimps and syndicates controlling them.

Think of it like this: charity comes along trying to build access to a normal life for sex workers— to give them education and jobs — suddenly if they don't have to depend on their pimps to survive — then the pimps lose their supply chain and their labor capital — which they can't allow. So the pimps have a vested interest in keeping outsiders from snooping around. To keep them from seeing the abuses

prostitutes face, to know of their wealthy clients, to see the child prostitutes. So what do they do? They handpick a few loyal prostitutes, the labor aristocracy, and they get those women to do some unspeakable crimes on outsiders until they either back off or the charity has the pimp syndicate's people do the work of the middle man.

Let's talk about Utsha. The transgender one who jumped off a roof and killed herself, not Asif Mahtab. She was physically attacked by a group of hijra women who declared she was a "fake hijra" trying to acquire money by pretending to be hijra and begging and doing sex work. This incident was conveniently filmed and posted on tiktok. Now, she didn't do any of that. But think of it like this: in Bangladesh hijra communes are hierarchicals. The guru (of course, not all commune leader gurus are cruel, I'm talking about a specific type who exist nonetheless because the current system inevitably breeds them) profits off the labor of her underlings, be it through begging or prostitution. When an underling defies this order—tries to say, get education or a job,— sometimes the consequence is telling her she'll never have a place in society as a gender-diverse person etc etc and if she goes through with it, sometimes she can be reported to the cops as "fake hijra" or a sodomite. Then comes the v-coding etc etc. It's as simple as pimps really, protecting your self-interest, making sure the supply of your labor capital stays intact.

Now the tale of Utsha being attacked by hijra groups? For a lot of liberals, it soured them on the hijra community, not understanding the difference between hijra women who are pressured into these activities under threat of losing life support and imprisonment as opposed to the one at the top who profits from securing territory and making sure a toll is paid to them by any gender diverse person who dares to exist. And a lot of conservatives got to use it to fuel their natural hijra vs fake transgender narrative.

But beyond that? What else could be the reason behind Utsha being attacked? Recently a powerful man has been on the dms of one of my transgender female mutual acquaintances. Threatening her that if she does not have intercourse to him he will organize Islamist mobs against her using his connections, that he will doxx her identity and location to them. Do you see how the attack on the trans female Utsha may have very well been organized?

See, the thing about these organized violence is that they seem spontaneous to casual observers rather than planned. And not only do they hurt the victims, but it

also gives feckless liberals a chance to say "society is too backwards to try for progress". Because they mistake these violent elements trying to secure profit or exploit people as a part of ordinary society as opposed to people specifically benefiting from bigotry.
Anyway, these tales? How transphobia is weaponized against trans people by "normal people" who seek to fuck them? V-coding? As in police syndicates paid by male prisoners putting trans women in male prisons over no real crime just with the express purpose of making sex slaves out of them? This grimy underworld? It wouldn't exist half as strongly as it does if lgbts had rights. All these mobs and syndicates are just the other face of the government. The Yin to their Yang. If the government didn't illegalize our existence, they couldn't exoticize us or sell us. So they need that shit. They need that illegalization. They need to keep their business going.
The more repressive the law and theocracy of a state, the stronger and more depraved shall be its criminal underworld. While they claim the unicorn on Eid parades are corrupting their children, lgbt children thrown out of home due to social taboo reinforced by the constitution and consequently sexually trafficked are suffering rape.

Don't Glorify or Romanticize Prostitution

Why is sex work suddenly being glamorized right about when the Curtis Yarvins are making their moves?
For most of feudalist history, being a sodomite was fine as long as you married a woman and left legitimized heirs. You could have a gay lover — they just had to be disposable. You could be a gender-divergent or what is called transgender today— unless you were the only legitimate heir, as long as you remained a whore. Is this an acceptable life for you? Being systemically designed and designated to be a disposable whore and not having your relationship legitimized? Because it is not for me. You dumbfucks glorify transgender temple priestesses, go look up what other "duty" they were made to perform for patriarchs. They were fucking whores. You dumbfucks romanticize hijra people as "entertainers" — while you put silencer on the word "whore". The "entertainment" they provide is not constrained within singing and dancing, you addlepated homunculi.

Do you want a fucking society where your child, if transgender or intersex, is taken to hijra communes and is made to be a prostitute? Is that fucking acceptable to you? But instead of seeking to create a society where whorism is not the option for transgender survival, you motherfuckers will seek to abuse your children into not being transgender. And the ones who can't be abused straight, with their traumatized mental vulnerability, will be made into whores.
The people who glorify these types of arrangements are not your friend. The Bengalis who insist that homosexuals can make love as long as they stay closeted — that trans people be socially exiled — when the ghettos built from this exile is rampant with prostitution are suspiciously offering similar "solutions" to the arrangement feudalists had for queers. In the age of technofeudalists like Moldbug having power, does this not seem oddly convenient for you? When people glorify feudalism under the guise of "anticolonialism" and acting like things were fine and dandy in feudalist societies and all sin resided with the Brits — in the era of the ruling class getting oddly interested in technofeudalism as an ideology— does this not seem oddly convenient to you?
Socialism or barberism. Do not trust "leftists" who romanticize feudalism under the name of "anticapitalism".

Conversion Therapy

Politicians (like Sarjis Alam) often present "conversion therapy" as an answer to lgbt people. This of course is to sate rich parents who worry their children might be lgbt and as a result suffer bigotry. Conversion therapy will of course only be accessible to the rich. Poor people won't be able to afford institutionally torturing their children under guise of therapy. So in the present dynamic in which lower class visibly queer lgbts are funneled into prostitution and rich people who are closeted exploit them — conversion therapy acts as a course correction or safeguard for lgbt people born to rich parents who may rebel against this social dynamic in their youth and come out of closet. Thus conversion "therapy" is used to torture them until they agree to get back to closet and dance to the tune of status quo and be one of those miserable closeted cishet-married middle aged people cheating on their partner— and this therapy/torture is a social symbol of repentance/redemption from their "temporary corruption by the lgbt agenda". Thus conversion therapy is offered to rich parents as an alternative to lgbt rights, and it

appeals to them because civil rights for lgbts would apply to all classes — meanwhile conversion therapy is an exclusive "solution" to the rich.

Shit Bangu Libs Say

"We should care more about changing social values first instead of changing laws that could help the marginalized!"

My brother in folly, the only reason you continue to walk on god's green earth is because I want to avoid the legal consequences of killing you with hammers rather than any socially installed values of empathy for people like you.

Furthermore on Bangladeshi Liberals:

Bangladeshi liberals have a spycraft-delusion disease. They think they're double agents working for some manner of greater good. That by internally being against the system but externally being fucking indistinguishable with a conservative in what they say and do will somehow result in a one critical moment in which they can strike and be a critical component to bring forth progress.
It's fucking bullshit and they're just right wingers with a guilt complex who can't embrace what they are.

To understand the Bengali liberal's relationship with queer marriage rights, you must first understand that the Bengali liberal is a worm of convenience, it is a dishonest creature and it is not too interested in dying. The Bengali liberal seeks civility and politeness and well regard from its political peers of all spectrums more than actually advocating for and achieving any goals.
And so the mild Bengali liberal, in a world where queer activists are butchered, and with its innate mindset of not seeking any change, to not be a hand but rather to be a voice, must not have any goals in its mind.
Because to have a goal is for it to admit that it may fail in achieving its goals. To have a goal unrealized is to accept continuous defeat. And while the Bengali liberal is a spineless creature, it must not accept its defeat externally.
And so the Bengali liberal removes itself from "goals". The Bengali liberal does not advocate for lgbt marriage rights or even civil union rights, because —beyond

everything it states as its reasons, the false circus of claiming marriage is capitalistic or theocratic and thus must not be seeked while it marries others itself— while the denial of it systemically reduces the life length of lgbts and passively murders them, hell, under the Marxist framework capitalism is a developmental stage, not a demonic evil, even if marriage has its source in that, to deny a community its rights for marriage is to deny it a part of that stage — because seeking marriage or civil union rights is a thing that can be achieved. And the Bengali liberal does not seek to *achieve*.

The Bengali liberal says instead something shallow and vague akin to that it cares more about "adapting social values in regards to how queer issues should be dealth with".

And so "Legal same-gender marriage rights" becomes "queer issues" in the mouth of the Bengali liberal because it gives it a chance for plausible deniability. It can say, when confronted by conservatives, that it is against legal "queer rights", because after all it never advocates for queer rights, simply how "queer issues" should be "dealt". Should the "queer issues" be dealt with positively or negatively is up to anyone's guess, the liberal vulture is likely to utter something about a "compromise" through self-muffled breaths in self-hushed voices. Maybe it shall say "queer issues should be dealt with more humanely", but you of course can butcher domestic animals more humanely for their meat. You can, of course, wear a velvet glove on your iron hands.

Because to say "queers are humans too" is an easy statement, we are after all biologically human. And the liberal feels well accomplished after stating this. It feels like it has achieved something. It feels "stunning and brave". To advocate for the raising of airy things like social values and social acceptance with no measurability is thus a low risk high reward activity. To say "labels don't matter" to lgbt activists becomes a "win" for the Bengali liberal, to say "maybe we shouldn’t murder lgbt activists ourselves by taking laws into our own hands, we have court and trial processes for that" is a "win" in the mind of the Bengali liberal. Its continuous existence itself is a "win" in its mind because after all it is a part of society and thus internally supporting lgbt people without ever stating so in a public platform or ever advocating for their rights automatically means the Bengali liberal has "won" by raising the accumulated "social values" of mass psyche by an indiscernible iota.

There is no chance of failure in a cause that has no goal. And the Bengali liberal can not accept failure, so it must not play games that have goals where it can fail. Bangladeshi liberals exhaust me because they identify a problem like child marriage and proceed to say shit like "changing laws has no point, we must dismantle the ideology".
No one is going to hear you preach to them. It's not a matter of simple ideology. If a poor family has the option to legally sell their children to a rich man, they will sell their children to a rich man. You need to ban child marriage to make it harder for them to do it. There will still be children slipping through the cracks in the safety net, but your goal is tightening the net, and making sure there's a safety net preventing the marriage at all. You can't simply vaguely gasture at a "dismantling of ideology" one day without taking the most obvious step first. This is a meaningless exercise. We can't stop all of the child marriages but we can stop at least a huge portion of them and we won't take the steps necessary for even that because we have fucking cucked ourselves into uttering buzzwords and phrases like "changing social values is more important than changing laws" without ever actually going anywhere.

In times of economical instability, war, disaster or famine— if a particular community in a war-affected society stops being a concern, if oppressing that particular community by the majority of that society starts becoming fine, if killing its people starts being fine because there are bigger problems, because the majority killing the minority are themselves under threat from a different global superpower — then that minority community was never not killable.
Liberals frame lgbt marriage rights as utopian, as a luxury item. Lgbts can fight for legal marriage recognition only after all other problems in the world have been solved according to liberals. Even though the lack of it systemically kills us, even though granting it to us would require spending not a single penny of state funds. And this frames lgbt lives as killable in any context other than an utopia. Because in any context other than an utopia our lives are worthless.
The conservatives who want to kill lgbt people both when the economy is unstable and even when the economy is stable are more honest about it. Because their hatred is unconditional. Meanwhile the liberals' allyship is conditional. And unconditional hate is superior to conditional care.

There is only gleeful butchering and unambiguous solidarity. And either is fine. But the devil's work is what it is done in the middle of that spectrum.
First world lgbt-phobes act like lgbt rights is a "first world problem" and third world lgbt-phobes act like "lgbt rights" are a "urban elite" problem. They won't directly say we shouldn't get marriage rights— but they'll say our marriage rights are not a huge issue or that it'll be fixed later. They act like lgbt civil rights is an utopian luxury item.
But we, lgbt people, exist without luxury in villages and refugee camps and slums and ghettos and lower classes. If our existence is not utopian, then our civil rights, our marriage rights is not utopian. We shall fight for what's ours here and now. We can't wait for your shitty fucking socialist utopia of the future to be established and wait around for total economic improvement before we get our rights which would cost you no fucking money to give to us.
We're not a fucking concept, we're not a fucking futuristic idea — so our rights can not be a futuristic idea.
And we'll get it through blood and fire if necessary.
The most damaging tendency of current Bangladeshi discourse is presenting one's care about or association with marginalised people or minorities as a signifier of one's class and production relations.
A Marxist lense placed onto reactionary eyes connected to reactionary brains.
The richest man can thus become "subaltern" by calling for the deaths of lgbt people — and all lgbt people regardless of their production relations, despite the visibly queer ones often living in ghettos thus are framed as "urban elites".
And the emphasis on living in urban areas as an indicator of one's privilege, as if cities are not standing on top of the living flesh of the poor, as if the working class in cities are any significantly well off than rural working class people, as if village ruling class people are any less exploitative than urban ones— too is a reactionary rhetorical device.
Queers are the acceptable sacrifice to leftists on the alter of their utopia. The foundation of their paradise built on the rotting meat and flesh of sodomites. After all there will always be a bigger problem. And so the right wingers can preach on hatred for the lgbts. It is important to maintain solidarity with them.
Outside countries where lgbts already have their rights, as long as leftists and theocrats have a common enemy, leftists will be fine with letting theocrats kill you.
This is why, while the lgbt movement must have socialist elements, we cannot

fully depend on cishet socialists. We need separate organizations of violent and terroristic queers too who would protect ourselves and attack them even when it may seem beneficial to socialists to ally with theocrats. Because they'll act like your rights are a luxury, there will forever be a bigger problem that needs their attention more unless you cause problems for them. Become a bigger problem.
This is not identity politics.
This is survival.
The rich queer leftists who can stay closeted will throw orgies behind the doors while maintaining lovely brotherhood with right wingers who preach for queers' death. They will not say a single thing in public in support of queers nor maintain association with them. But behind the doors will act as if their personal opinion that which they never voice anywhere in a public platform elevates them to a status of sainthood.
Here's something liberals pretend not to understand regarding lgbt rights that they understand about all else: right wingers do not want us dead, they just want us sequestered out of normal society. They want to put us in our "station" as designated by them.
Understand this: conservatives are not extremists the same way an executioner or a soldier carrying out the state's decree is not a serial killer — conservatives are much worse, they're players of respectability politics.
The KKK lynched black people not because they're fundamentally against the existence of black people, but because black people rejected the station on which they had been placed. Misogynists don’t want women dead. They just want women to be in their station.
Xulhaz Mannan didn’t get killed because he was gay! He got killed because he rejected the low station, because he wanted his goddamn rights.
See, so liberal fuckwads flap their mouth about lgbt people and say "we shouldn’t give them rights, we should just let them live because they're humans too". And in this liberals enable right wingers. Because the point of right wingers' ideology is not to kill lgbts. It is to sexualize us, eroticize us, to a point which disallows us engagement in normal society beyond "safe spaces" of exploitation in which rich people can "entertain" themselves with our existence. See, statements about the humanity of lgbt people is thus meaningless. Reject humanity, chase after your legal fucking rights. Because liberals will play with right wingers to create

sequestrations within society because they view you as inherently a walking talking "mature material" otherwise.
Bangladeshi liberals' idea of harmony and multipolarism is creating ghettos with shit conditions for transgender people while viewing our existence as inherently sexual and calling it a "safe space" and then tearing it down a few years later instead of fighting against sequestration. "Co-existence" without certain legal rights for one of the groups is super-existence for the one who has it and sub-existence for the one that doesn't.
Fuck harmony. Give rights.
Every once in a while i get some liberal dipshit who starts listing the woes of the world to me to hammer home how i don't deserve happiness in a terrain troubled with such suffering and the point they always miss is that i have already accepted the fact- i don't think i deserve to find happiness - but i will try anyway, I will fight for it anyway- and i don't think they deserve to find happiness either - and at the end they have a harder time accepting what they don't deserve themselves than i do.

The difference between the right wing homophobe and the moderate-anticapitalist-feudalist homophobe is that the right wing one doesn't care about how many fits you throw about being killed but the feudalist one will find your dying defiance too unpalatable and "individualistic" for having ruined their collective illusion of tranquillity.

Liberalism asks its marginalized to only be brave, but never dangerous. Bravery in itself is inert, you can take bravely a thousand beatings. But it is the imperative of the abused woman to poison her husband's dinner.

Being a "feminist" or being a "working class supporter" or being an "indigenous ally" or saying "lgbts are humans too" does not actually mean anything. You need to have actual policies you seek to instate or change. You can't just have "good values" in your heart that don't go beyond a feeling of positive attitude toward these people. You must clarify what laws you want, what laws you don't want. Do you want to abolish child marriage, illegalize marital rape and ensure equal distribution of property for women? Do you want to raise the minimum wage for laborers, meet the demands of the trade union, make it so that factory owners have

to pay interest for delaying the workers' due wages from being paid (because delayed payments work as an interest free loan from workers to capitalists as of now)? Do you want to ensure sovereignty for indigenous people and meet the agreements of the hill tracts peace treaty? Do you want to allow homosexuals to be legalized and marry each other? To transgenders to be able to buy hormones and change legal gender and get marriage rights?
These are things that concern civil rights. Having good vibes or just saying you want equality is vague and has no meaning. These are questions you should judge your politicians based on. Not simply ask them if they support this or that. Specify the policies. Bangladeshi conservatives manufacture consent to oppress lgbt people, Bangladeshi liberals manufacture compliance of the lgbt people — they exist to discourage radical action and dangle the hope of incremental change near the nose of lgbts, the incremental change which will never ever come, but nonetheless infect us with false hope of peaceful progress to keep us from taking up arms and fight for our legal marriage rights.

Fuck Your Alleyship

My goal is not to stay alive or keep other lgbt people alive at the mercy of the rich.
My goal is not getting acceptance for lgbt people. The goal is not "general lgbt activism", the goal is particular and specific.
My goal is getting marriage rights or civil union rights for lgbt people.
This is an actual goal, not a vague desire for a "better treatment" dependant on the vague whims of the masses. Not a general "lgbt activism" without any specification of the legal rights that are the end-goal.
This is not perfectionism, this is concrete-ism.
Utopianism or perfectionism would be if I wanted everyone to " accept" lgbt people as "normal" or wanted all violence and bigotry to cease. But that's not the goal.
The goal is something that can either be or not be because it’s definite.
And maybe that goal is unrealistic, fine. Maybe I will not have enough allies for it, fine. But it's more desirable for me to perish in its pursuit than to accept doggy treats from under the table from politicians acknowledging my humanity but offering no change to civil rights and expecting me to shake my tail for it. I would prefer death over it. Every day I beg for death over it.

It's a mistake to view allyship as a club in which you compliment each other or hype each other up. Someone who doesn't want marital rape banned is automatically the enemy of someone who wants marital rape banned.
For someone who views alleyship as a club, a self-proclaimed feminist claiming they support women but not the ban of marital rape is an acceptable person to exchange pleasantries with. Politics thus becomes less than theater performance with no actual authenticity behind it or the willingness to change policies. There's no value in respecting each other's humanity in this construct. It's, well, a dinner party. And a dinner party doesn't change anything.
But for someone who wants marital rape banned and that's their goal, and it's evident that this other person will not change their mind beyond revelling in the base act of endlessly exchanging pleasantries, this club-like dynamic or circlejerk of diplomacy has no value.
The reason I don't identify as a feminist or lgbt "activist" is because these terms are vague.
The point is changing specific policies. Not creating a club of people who like the sound of these words and have their own distinct impression of what they mean.
So I say I want marital rape banned, child marriage with parental consent banned, lgbt marriage legalized — because these are things that have meaning more than a vague feeling of sympathy for women or lgbts.
There is an actual goal there. Something that goes beyond "I think women are humans too". Because this obvious declaration of humanity muddies the actual intent of what needs to be achieved. If a feminist supports child marriage or marital rape, I do not wish to be in a " movement" with them or meet them where they are because they're in the opposite direction of where I am.
If an "lgbt activist" thinks lgbts should just not have legal recognition and forever float around as unrecognized elements in society with no legal security, I do not wish to be in a " movement" with them or meet them where they are because they're in the opposite direction of where I am.
You must have clear goals you seek to achieve. A crowd of people that doesn't know what it wants is a crowd of people that breaks into stores and steals items. So there's no point in just amassing as many people as you can make appeal to, who don't want the things that you want to achieve.

Hydra

If Bangladeshi conservative queerphobes wanted the lgbt community to truly be gone they would be lobbying for law enforcement to sign onto gay dating apps or just toggle on the "interested in male" option as male in bumble or tinder to catch queers. Their goal is not extermination.
The conservatives' goal is to keep queers stratified into a particular section of social hierarchy by denying them legal rights and to keep them in fear from demanding those rights. So the question comes — what makes a liberal or a queer organization leader who insists lgbts stay hidden and closeted and not demand legal rights functionally different than a conservative politician or intellectual?
The answer is there is no difference. They are two heads of the same beast. No matter how many gay or trans friends the liberal has, no matter whether the liberal is itself gay or trans — if it advocates for secrecy and closet and silence — then it is the same animal as the conservative.
And you and I brother must slay the dragon or perish trying — better than the suicidal suffocation in the coffin that passes for a closet.

Here's A Joke for You

A Bangladeshi liberals walks into a laborer strike. They're demanding to raise the minimum wage.
The liberal says to them "Ahem, it actually doesn't matter at all to legally raise the minimum wage. Because the law wouldn’t be effective and they'd delay your payment anyway. What we need is to change the social values of capitalists! Once capitalists become ideologically as free minded as us, they will raise the minimum wage on their own! Laws won't even be necessary!”

Another Joke:

Bangladeshi leftists are too obsessed with culture war. As we all know countries are culturally regressive and lean toward the right because they're poor. And they magically become progressive with wealth. This is why United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arab, America and Russia — rich as they are — are the most progressive countries in the world.

On a serious note, the problem with Bangladeshi liberals is that they recognize the truth "fascism is capitalism in crisis" but too often they arrive to the conclusion that instead of fighting fascism or fighting the class war or fighting capitalism to establish socialism — the imperative is to *take capitalism out of this crisis* before minorities can fight for their civil rights.
This is folly because it is the nature of capitalism to be in forever-crisis. The rich get richer through economical crises. Every single time a crisis happens, it's capitalists who accumulate wealth.
That's why you can't fix capitalism long enough to ever get to the fight for minorities' civil rights. The ruling class will never be placated enough. The middle class will never be placated enough.
So you can't have it both ways. You don't get to pretend civil rights is culture war while also not fighting the class war but seeking to establish a class treaty in which capitalism is stabilized and the bourgeoisie mind their own business and leave the marginalized alone.

If the superstructure of a society can't be changed without changing its substructure — but improving the substructure is not within your capability — but as damaging it is easier — then if the superstructure of a society deems it so that your kin are denied civil rights, denied security of marriage and legal recognition— then it is your responsibility to bring change to the substructure by damaging it instead. If the people who benefit from the existing substructure so much that they think granting marginalized people civil rights will destroy their favorable status quo, then their favorable status quo must be destroyed with suicide bombings and vigilante murders as a direct consequence of those marginalized people being denied their civil rights.

Beyond Empty Allyship

Being a "feminist" or being a "working class supporter" or being an "indigenous ally" or saying "lgbts are humans too" does not actually mean anything. You need to have actual policies you seek to instate or change. You can't just have "good values" in your heart that doesn’t go beyond a feeling of positive attitude toward these people. You must clarify what laws you want, what laws you don't want.

Do you want to abolish child marriage, illegalize marital rape and ensure equal distribution of property for women? Do you want to raise the minimum wage for laborers, meet the demands of trade union, make it so that factory owners have to pay interest for delaying the workers' due wages from being paid (because it works as an interest free loan to capitalists as of now)? Do you want to ensure sovereignty for indigenous people and meet the agreements of the hill tracts peace treaty? Do you want to allow homosexuals to be legalized and marry each other? To transgenders to be able to buy hormones and change legal gender and get marriage rights?
These are things that concern civil rights. Having good vibes or just saying you want equality is vague and has no meaning. These are questions you should judge your politicians based on. Not simply ask them if they support this or that. Specify the policies.

Fuck Your Intellectualism

Bangladeshi intellectuals are treating lgbt issue — as in our existence rather than our lack of civil rights — as a moral or ethical or scientific dilemma rather than a matter of civil rights.
They can not conceive us as livibg breathing people negatively and systemically impacted not only by criminalization but specifically by lack of legal marriage rights.
To them our question is a question of culture clash or geopolitical show of power rather than our lives being ruined due to syemtic and legal fuckery.
When we demand our marriage rights which would help us survive a little longer they get into the matter of whether marriage itself is ethical. It's all a bullshit fucking performance that's not going to go anywhere.
At the end of the day, the weight of our bodies are heavier than ideologies and ethical debates. We need civil rights that materially impact us to have the fighting chance in life that even other people who share our class have. A lower class lgbt person has less chance of survival than a lower class average cishet person due to our criminalization and lack of marriage rights. And that's what it boils down to. Not ideology, not ethics, not morality. Whether we get to have access to the things you have access to. That's the question. And if your answer is "no", then our answer is violence.

On a Certain Type of Closeted Bigots

When invisibility and safe space Queer people as their life-support embrace:
queers who are inherently visible are seen by them as life-threat, risible, deserving of condemnation, scorn, fear. To preserve their cherished “safety” so dear. Lest the masses be reminded that they do indeed exist, much to their dismay. Thus: the girly faggot, the manly dyke, Also the tranny- they come to dislike. And thus they blame their oppression onto those wretches, ones who suffer the most too. That's how we cannibalize each other. And that's the way how brother kills brother.

On the Accusation of Queers being Western Agents or Consumers:

Western queers were only able to acquire their rights after years of battling against the western status quo. Countless western queers like Tyra Hunter and Robert Eads died and are dying from institutional neglect and bigotry. Countless have been hate crimed and are being hate crimed.
Working Class History Podcast was talking about these British miners who were striking for better pay, and an lgbt group with solidarity fundraised for their union. And they talked about this local conservative newspaper which used to send reporters to hang around outside those gay bars and their "journalists" would write down the names and track down the addresses of everyone who entered the bar, and they would publish it in the newspaper to doxx the queer people.
Recently a Bangladeshi online "newspaper" has posted a random wall painting of two people of indeterminable gender holding hands at the BRAC university wall stating that bracu students are drawing lgbt people at the campus with the tagline "seems like they're not trying to beat the allegations".
You know, Rush Limbaugh this American radio host during the AIDS pandemic he used to read the names of every lgbt people who died from it in his channel and he would play airhorn music to celebrate their deaths.
And when Shila Chakma was murdered and Imam Muhsin too Bangladeshis celebrated their deaths.
You know all these cruelties feel overbearing sometimes. But the truth is the right wing of today imitates all of their cruelty from the right wing of yore. Be it Bangladeshi online newspapers mimicking past British newspapers — or

Bangladeshi internet influencers mimicking American radio hosts. But after all this, we still survive at the end of the day. We will lose many people, but just like how the British or the American right wing pricks couldn't wipe off all their queers, neither can the right wing of our country wipe off us.

Non-western queers die from the same drone bombs, the same starvation, the same natural disasters wrought by capitalism, the same factory deregulations that kill cis straight people. The only difference is that we have to hear people call us "pawns of the west" or "pawns of the bourgeoisie" while all that happens instead of getting some quiet.

When I criticize anti-consumerism removed from Marxism, and I always specify that I'm only criticizing it when it does not have Marxist critique focusing on laborer's rights (or have ill-understanding of Marxist critique in their misusage), certain people with inherently hostile attitude to faggots and trannies assume I'm advocating for morons to buy a new phone every year or to buy mass produced goods just to stay trendy. That's not what I'm fucking doing! I'm against all that, dumbass. Let me illustrate what specific strain of anti-consumerism I'm talking about first!

So last year there was a bunch of hotel fires in Bangladesh. Workers? Dead. Customers eating there? Fucking dead. Overall death toll? Over hundred. Why did it happen? Poor building regulations not meeting safety standards because capitalists were greedy and the system supposed to regulate them were corrupt. And in comes the fuckturd liberal intellectual, what does he do? Does he blame the system? No! He blames the Bengali race for being "greedy" and "food-addicted" "consumerists" and acts like these tragedies that killed workers too was a result of their sin of consumption. This rhetoric thus becomes popular and shifts focus away from systemic greed, corruption and workers' exploitation.

Our markets are controlled by syndicates that fuck over the toiling farmers by paying them peanuts while selling their production at high price. In comes the fuckturd liberals. What do they do? They claim the solution to organized syndicates, instead of killing them, is for average people (whom they condemn as greedy consumerists) to simply eat homegrown products for a year. Does that sound realistic or sustainable to you? No. The intellectuals who spread this rhetoric are not anarchoprimitivists relying on their selves. They're putting down the value of collective justice in favor of individual unsustainable actions.

Let's talk about how shallow anticonsumerism rhetoric gets used against marginalized communities. Now, let me preface this saying: images of socialist icons such as Che Guevara are mass produced on merchandises in sweatshops, Soviet Union hats are mass produced and sold in sweatshops— does that mean socialism is inherently a bourgeoisie ideology? Obviously, no, even an idiot knows that. Capitalism subsumes all aesthetics and symbols. This is known. Religious artifacts are mass produced too. Now are all muslims inherently consumerists and bourgeoisie because corporations mass produce products with stars and crescents and ottoman aesthetics and *some* muslims buy them? Obviously, no, once again! But then, some intellectual morons accuse the lgbt community of being consumerist soft-capitalists (a meaningless term) because sweatshops produce rainbow flags too and *some* lgbt people buy these mass produced merchandise. They claim they are not against men fucking men but they're against the various “lgbt labels”, because they claim the labels were invented to sell products targeted to these identities, which again is a moronic fucking claim. No, the labels needed to exist because an oppressed group of people who deal with intense illegalization and denial of rights (often even denied from participation in modes of production to even be considered part of the proletariat and thus forced to be lumpen prostitutes and criminals left historically ignored in socialist nations) need a shared identity to build solidarity for each other. Of course capitalism capitalizes on the identity of the homosexual and transgender, it capitalizes on all fucking identities, this does not mean people of these identities thus become “bourgeoise” or that even most people of these identities even buy such merchandise. So to say that a community is bourgeoisie when most of them are poor and they're killed not only in the global south but also in the west is an inhumane fucking thing to do.
Let's about transsexuals. Trans people who takes hormones to ease their sense of dysphoria is condemned by these scholarly fuckturds for being “consumerist”, some point out various injustices in the creation of hormonal medicines to condemn it altogether and declare it unnatural. Motherfucker everything from polio vaccines to abortion to the understanding of anatomy has dark histories of abused marginalized people in them. Does this mean you'll reject these technologies that have already been developed? Do you reject medicines for the cold or glasses for your eyes because blind people didn't have access to this technology before and thus it's unnatural to use it now? Secondly, there are trans people, chemists or people with chemical knowledge, who produce their own hormones without

buying from corporations. Tell me, are you fine with hormones created without corporate ties or do you think those trans people are “brainwashed” by the “big pharma” as well to sell more “products” and thus are deserving of condemnation? Are you against state produced estrogen and testosterone in socialist nations like Cuba that are beginning to stop fucking over trannies too? Or do you think trannies in socialist countries are brainwashed by the big pharma too? The funniest thing about traditionalists who are pro-natalists trying to frame transgender people as corporate-invention consumers of medicines is that you can frame those cishets as corporate-invention consoomers who are making the act of creating babies a huge part of their identity and in the process are tricked into consoooming more and more resources and are tricked into spending money to uh buy things. Its bullshit, just like framing trans people as slaves of consumer culture is bullshit. But two can play at that game.

People saying moronic dumbass shit like "gender dysphoria treated by hormones instead of mental therapy is a concept invented by the medical industry to get money off people" is really funny. Do you think therapists who try to convince trans people that they're not trans aren't gonna make money off it?
Or do you think the existence of a medical industry makes every medical instrument produced by it inherently capitalist? Because you should give up on wearing eyeglasses then.
Also, it's funny because we've seen how you fucking bastards treat even slightly feminine guys, crossdressers, eunuchs and also just intersex and trans people who don't take hormones. You're not any kinder to them. Or if you're indeed kind, your kindness exists in the boundary of person to person interaction and you keep them downtrodden all the same institutionally and socially by denying them access to education and work. Because they can exist alright, as long as they exist under the streetlight or in the gay bars and prostitution villages you can be a tourist in to visit, away from marring your polite society.

All this, I say, not to dismiss anti-consumerism altogether — but rather to clarify that my critique of anti-consumerism without honesty and earnestness is dependant on people using it for the benefit of oppressive classes. Because, ironically enough, certain anti-consumerists are selling you something. Even if it's ideas such as

hatred against your brethren or self-loathing because you don't have the land to grow food for yourself and need to rely on syndicate-controlled market.

There's a type of Bangladeshi scholar who won't say shit about Bangali colonization of indigenous people lest the government targets them and they won't say anything about the genocide committed against Palestinian people by western countries lest the foreign university they're applying to cancels them but they WILL write shitty research papers falsely claiming lgbt+ people are a sinister product of western culture to vilify all lgbt+ people everywhere despite a majority of homeless people in western countries being lgbt+ people thrown out of home and denied jobs in workplaces because they know they can get away with it without much pushback.

There's no “soft”-ness to imperialism and capitalism. These are material things with material impact on reality. "Soft imperialism" "soft capitalism" are bullshit buzzwords these intellectual morons use to play aesthetic wars signifying everything they hate including lgbt people as elements of imperialism and capitalism. Because to actually move beyond the softness of aesthetics would make their lives hard in unpleasant ways.

There was a Palestinian man once who, as he held the dead body of a Palestinian child killed by the evil zionists, the Palestinian man said: "Enough. Enough. Either execute us all at once or stop the bloodshed."
I will not pretend to understand the absolute heart wrenching trauma Palestinian people suffer every day.
But I have had enough queer friends die due to systemic passive violence or active hate crimes throughout my life that I wish every state all over the world would execute all lgbt people including me at once as well. Because in death we would have peace— instead of being kept alive like the human batteries in Matrix for the entertainment of the very same rich people who pass the queerphobic laws against us. A whole scale genocide against lgbts with regular executions would be easier for me to stomach than the present status quo.

The average Bangladeshi person who doesn’t care about politics beyond "Fuck you, you shouldn’t have killed civilians" is less of an idiot than the average

politics enthusiast because the latter is more likely to whip up the dumbest fucking pop-culture nonsense ass conspiracy theory possible and target several vulnerable minorities in the process to appease their shitass paranoia drive. And thus feminism becomes a foreign propaganda, and indigenous rights become foreign propaganda, and lgbt rights become foreign propaganda. Because you must seem wise to your pissdrinking schlock regurgitating fans.

Bangladeshis who accuse lgbt people of being “illuminati” pretend to be blind when world's richest billionaires actively help reestablish anti-lgbt laws in America and Christian corporations like Hobby Lobby fund and bribe politicians in the global south to pass death sentence laws against homosexual and transgender people. This is because they don't believe in any of that shit, they just accuse us of being “illuminati” simply because they can and no one is stopping them. Illuminati conspiracy theories are so prevalent among Bangu petty bourgeoisie because they are poor enough to view some rich people as their enemy but rich enough to not condemn the thieving of surplus value and workers not rightfully owning the means of production. They know there's something fucked with the system, but they won't condemn the system, because they benefit just enough from it, and so they must condemn external forces. That's why these flimsy fucking cucks need to be blown away with bombs.

Brain dead shit gobblers who spout crap like "lgbt+ people tend to be rich/upper middle class/urbanites and don't represent the working class" tend to be rich/upper middle class themselves. Their misinformed mindset stems from the fact that the only lgbt people they know are upper mid/rich/urbanites - because the only people *in general* whom they know are rich and upper mid and live in cities and are from the same social circle as them. Go out there and know more people instead of saying dumb fucking crap. Like people act genuinely surprised that I grew up in a village or didn't go to a fuckin English medium school or had an easy life or whatever after saying something like that and getting whipped back and getting an actual painted picture of what my life has been like. I still have it easy compared to a lot of other people, but there are shitload of lgbt+s who have it way worse than me in terms of financial and societal status. Every economical obstacle cis and straight people face, lgbt+s do too. I can't help it if you create fanfictions about me

or the community in your head. You're a pretentious wanker who uses "umm there's other injustices" to try silencing people talking about shit they face.

The Bangladeshi neo-feudalist pseudo-anticapitalists care for the working class the same way a patriarchal man cares for his subservient wife whose diminutive status is a condition of the dynamic.

When it comes to Bangladeshi intellectuals and politicians, their idea of fighting colonial hegemony is inserting their own version of nationalist patriarchal fascist hegemony in its place as replacement. But the thing about violence is that it's a two way street — and even if it’s not, I will drive to the opposite direction.

Symbolism in Nothing

Bangladeshi homophobes see "lgbt propaganda" in unicorn statues and cake decorations because they can afford to. It's a fun past-time for them. Like seeing illuminati in drawings of eyes and usage of triangles in icons. It gives them an appearance of deeper knowledge that does not require knowledge. You too can be Sherlock Holmes with no observation skills nor possessing applicable information. You too can get cookie points on the internet with others hyping you up for your moral righteousness.
The only way to put them down is by giving something real and something concrete to oppose. Get out of the closet, fight for lgbt marriage rights. No compromise. No appeal to culture or morality or ethics. No "we're humans too". No "I don't think homosexuals amd transgenders should be outright murdered but we should give them therapy to turn them straight or put them through constitutional trial process rather than killing them in vigilante fashion".
None of it means anything. They will yell at shadows from dawn till dusk. So give them something concrete, give them something tangible. Fucking fight.
As long as the intellectual sphere holds up the premise that things being accused of lgbt ruins them or makes them questionable and denies the validity of the tag rather than battling lgbtphobia — things and people will continue to get tagged as such by theocrats because their weapon is not being taken away— but they're simply being told their target is wrong.
If there shall be cowards, they should suffer for their cowardice.

But the more repressive the law and theocracy of a state, the stronger and more depraved shall be its criminal underworld. While they claim the unicorn on Eid parades are corrupting their children, lgbt children thrown out of home due to social taboo reinforced by the constitution and consequently sexually trafficked are suffering rape.

Culture War

In Bangladesh, there are two forces of culture-police that try to control people's participation in other cultures.
First is the Bengali supremacist, the Bengali supremacist allows the theological cultural celebrations, but forbids the cultural celebration of western and east-asian cultures.
The other force, the majority-theocrat culture-police only allows the people who follow the majority faith to celebrate majority-theologist cultural events. The majority-theocrat decries Bengali culture as being infused by the minority-theology. And thus unacceptable to be performed by majority-theos, tantamount to infidelity. Which is a killable offense.
The Bengali supremacist blocks western and eastern culture, and the theocrat blocks the Bengali culture, which the Bengali supremacist does not effectively combat. And so really, these two forces are but one, acting so that the majority-theos without scrutiny can only perform the cultural celebrations of the majority-theology.
One of the reasons that conservatives, no matter which country - rally against any cultural festivals and celebrations that are not part of their particular theology is because cultures and festivals bring people together.
The feeling of togetherness and the feeling of having a community unassociated from the theology in question inspires lack of dependence on the theology. This means less sectarianism. This means you can't use a part of the masses to control and exploit another part of it.
The cultural festivals related to the theology of the conservatives bringing people who believe in it together inspires a feeling of proximity to the divine among those people when they're in reality sensing human connection and communal harmony. And when they sense human connection and communal harmony from festivals that are not related to the conservatives' ideology, then the feeling of that

divinity-proximation associated with the conservatives' theology becomes mundane and common-place.
Conservatives want a monopoly on harmony. Conservatives want a monopoly on fun. They want these things to exist only as long as they can control it through social engineering.
They want to control what makes you feel happy like a tube that feeds you nutrients. They get to decide what's in it. They want to condition you like Pavlov's dog. Make you shake your tail.

A Hammer to the Culture War

Hijra people occupy quite a contradictory space in how they're discussed by others. The proudly-right-wing, claiming to be uh traditional— must reckon with the contradiction that arises from decrying transgender people as a western invention while not being able to deny the cultural history of hijra people. AND SO! They declare only intersex people are real hijra. Although the hijra identity intersects between both some intersex people, some trans women, and just hijra people who identify as just hijra rather than either intersex or trans women. So in this framing of right wingers trans women become: homosexual men who are trying to push the homosexual agenda under the label of transgender while also being transgenders who are pushing the transgender agenda under the label of hijra. Hahahahaha!
The apolitical centrists just complain like fucking morons about hijra prostitutes and beggers in public spaces — compelling Hijra commune leaders to claim "those are just men pretending to be hijra to get money" and thus further feeding into the "only intersex people are real hijra" claims.
The shameful-right-wing which claims to be left wing however uses the hijra identity as a catch-all term for lgbt people in a vague way when lgbt issues come to the forefront. They will say that they intend to address these issues in a cultural traditional manner with sympathy for the people affected— and they go on to talk about how hijra people were tolerated in precolonial times: mind you, they don't dismantle the proud-right-wing claim that only intersex people are real hijra — this claim acts as yang to their yin— so they can make vague claims of solving lgbt issues in a cultural manner: which can be interpreted as “only intersex people will get rights” by those who are inclined to interpret it as so while pacifying the lgbts.

See, they don't talk about the koti or the anurbhan. They just vaguely dogwhistle about maybe one day treating hijra people with compassion. By which they mean sequestering hijra people from society while occasionally allowing them to have low wage jobs.
See, you can play culture war all you want, you can call the gays “koti” or the trans men “anurbhans” instead of gay or trans. You won't, of course, you will at the end act like hijra identity consists only of intersex people.
A few years back a TERF teacher after offering me suicide assistance and telling me I don't know what eve-teasing cis women face in the streets asked me if she could just claim to be a man if she started wearing shirts and pants. She ignored that transgender men (as in born female but transitioned to male) in even Bangladeshi media literally get better coverage — get to speak with mullahs in mahfils. In UK a law passed recently officially stating that transgender women are no longer officially recognized as women. The law doesn’t state jackshit about trans men, they can be recognized as men.
It’s almost like TERFS benefit from acting like transgender men don't exist. When people use transgender as a noun, they really mean transgender women, because to acknowledge transgender men exist would mean they can't use the "wolf in sheepskin" rhetoric to demonize trans women any longer.
But the question, beyond labels, beyond whichever language you want to use to address us is really whether you will give people of a gender the rights to marry people of the same gender.
Let me clear away the confusion.
Since your lot wants to play bioessentialism.
Since there is so much cultural baggage.
If you claim I'm a homosexual man claiming to be transgender and transgenders are claiming to be hijra—
Then fine.
I shall be a homosexual man who just looks like a girl.
But then what?
Use whatever cultural terminology you want to use.
Call me koti or a ghetuputro since you want to act like hijra are all eunuch or intersex.
If you want to play that game I will play that game.
If you want to be bioessesntialist I shall be bioessesntialist.

Because at the end of all these, the claims that you will address these issues in a cultural manner, the simple question is, beyond identities, beyond labels: "Can an XX chromosomed person marry an XX chromosomed person at the end? Can an XY chromosomed person marry an XY chromosomed person at the end? Can an XX chromosomed person look like an XY chromosomed person without facing legal issues? Can an XY chromosomed person look like an XX chromosomed person without facing legal issues?"
Because if the answer is no, and the answer will be no, because after all your meaningless circlejerking, you have no positive incentive to give us our marriage or civil union rights— I will be there to give you your negative incentive. If you gain nothing by giving us marriage rights then I shall introduce you to loss for not giving us marriage rights. You'll understand when my hammer consummates its relationship with the cavity in your skull. You'll understand when the coziness of explosions blanket your homes in the cold of the night.
The point of queer terrorism is really, to take a hammer to the culture war. Because at the end all these accusations of being a western agent or the spawns of satan don't remain, they get washed away by the fire.

On the So-Called Historical Acceptance of Hijra people:

Thinking Hijra people before colonization were in a good position in society because they had jobs as tax collectors is like thinking the Jews were in a well regarded position in medieval European society when they were funneled into banking after getting other survival opportunities denied.
When the state can't kill off an entire group of people, it turns them into a sequestered cultural attraction - either in a family friendly or a taboofied exoticist manner. Visiting them or even allowing their existence to perpetuate becomes a "testament" to the humanity of their oppressors. Be it indigenous people or hijra people.
The more an ideology or identity is put through a monolithization process, the more will it make its foundations shakier on a long term basis. Be it cultural, political or religious. And so- with the destruction or gentrification of majars, the process of the monolithization of religion has escalated.
The hijra identity too, despite having various subcategories, is now being put through a monolithization process. As people outside the community try to define

what is acceptable to be included therein, while handpicking only specific voices from within the community to boost which matches them ideologically or rather has to match them ideologically in order to ensure survival.
Bengali feudalists who act like intersex/gender-diverse children are better off at a hierarchal commune where the leader siphons money off underlings in a world where children are vulnerable to predation rather than being raised at their parents' home with family and access to education are fucking moronic. Only braindead fucking bangus could be proud of forcing minorities into forming cults through sequestration.
If the right wing truly cared about hijra people (as opposed to us degenerate troony faggots) as they say, they would be making public infomercials begging parents not to throw out their hijra children to hijra groups and actually raise them rather than building a society which presents hierarchical communes as the only option.

The Transgenders: Too Privileged and Too Lowly

If you can comprehend that Sheikh Hasina being the Prime Minister didn't mean feminism made strides in Bangladesh- you should be able to comprehend that a handful of trans male and trans female students being able to access education on an University level doesn't mean trans rights movement is making strides in Bangladesh.
It's a weird sort of point we are in where a handful of trans people who have education access are being used to characterize the entire community as privileged or without problems — even though they themselves have various obstacles they must surmount every day — while the poor trans people who need to beg or prostitute to feed themselves and to get shelter and to survive are being used by classists to characterize the community as """degenerates""". So we go to a point where in their point of view, the community is simultaneously too privileged and bourgeoise to need support and also too "lowly" and "degenerate" to care about.

Furthermore on Liberals— Appeal to Culture:

When they say "sodomites and third genders were part of our culture" what they mean by their culture is the hegemonic culture of their ruling class. And so they declare they don't want faggots and trannies to have legal marriage rights — but

they just want us to be allowed to live because their feudal fucking society didn't have rights for anyone beyond the rights of the ruling class. So really what their intention is, is to make rights-less faggots and trannies survive long enough to be abused by the current ruling class just like how the bottoms and hijras of the feudal society without any rights were allowed to survive just long enough to be abused by feudal lords.
They want the tale of *Ghetuputro Komola* to be repeated, again and again and again. They don't want to give us the rights to marry as adults. They don't us to even get an escape by being executed or hate crimed because that would be too fucking easy of a way out. They want to use our living bodies as the foundation upon whcih the apex of the pyramid they inhabit is built.
The only thing worse than a conservative is a liberal.

The thing about ancient history is every couple and every relationship you hear of is going to have fucked up elements. War-slave concubines and underage marriages common. And you may say "well you can't judge them by today's standards" but I don't feel particularly inclined to apply onto lords and monarchs the hegemonic lense of their creation and choosing. Peasants had loves more true than any lost to the floods of time. The mementos of their loves un-enshrined un-preserved are not here for us to be voyeured by. Be the peasants straight or gay.
And this is where how queers approach historical "couples" becomes interesting. Queers are battling with two accusations that are relevant to this.
1) the false accusation that they never existed till modernity
2) the false accusation that not having historical records of existence means they're a modern invention, which means they're all perverted degenerate freaks with dynamics where "pure romance" can not blossom.

To battle the first accusation queers turn to historical records of male/male, female/female couples and trans people. But this approach is antithetical to battling the second accusation which spurred them on in the first place.
Because straight people do not have the burden of proving past existence, it's obvious male/female couples were existent among peasants in antiquity even without detailed historical records.
But as straight relationships of ruling class people are the only ones that survive majorly in records, so do too the queer relationships of ruling class people. And

suddenly bigots use the records of queers in ruling class positions to portray them as oppressors.
And of course, people with power do fucked up shit, and the extent of the fucked up shit they do apply to their partners.
But the straight historical husband abusing his underage slavegirl-wife does not demonize straight people, but it demonizes queers when he does it to a slaveboy. Nero kicking his pregnant wife to death is not an indictment of straight people. But the problem is that to show proof of queers in his time people point at him and Sporus. But Sporus was not the captive boy's name, that name given to him by Nero meant “semen”, and the rape and abuse he suffered and the eventual suicide to avoid public violation as spectacle leaves no room for romanticization.
And suddenly the second accusation find its roots in the effort to dispute the first accusation, because to show historical proof you turn to rulers, and when have rulers ever not been fucked up pieces of shits?
Instead of riding that route of ouroboric debate, save your time by escalating the argument into a fisticuff instead. That would be a very historical way of winning, in an argument about history.

Like imagine saying "fagtroons shouldn’t be allowed rights in western society but we should let them live because emperor nero castrated a boy and named him Sporus which meant Semen"
No you fucking prick, every fucking ruling class cunt is a cunt, I'm not gonna model my current existence based on your feudal pederast theocratic maggots because you think that's your culture. Shove your culture up there, shithead. Give me marriage fucking rights.

An Attempt at Satirizing Feudalist Postmodernist "LGBT Allies"

Since the intellectuals of Bangladesh are now saying "oh we don't hate Igbts, but their marraige rights is western culture, we'll approach their issues as traditionally and culturally appropriate to our history", and since marriage rights as discussed is required in various life-saving institutional aspects including getting rented places, familial consent for surgeries, burial, bank accounts etc — so instead of the right to marry, I am coming up with another proposal of compromise and meeting people in the middle that goes with the history and culture of Bangladesh!

The rights to consensual sexual slavery of adult LGBT bottoms. We have a rich history of male feudal lords owning male sex slaves. In the modern day, according to my proposal, the adult top male will be legally recognized as the "Zamidar-owner" and the adult bottom male will be recognized as "ghetuputro-slave" on official papers instead of calling them "husband and husband". This institutional recognition would be equivalent to marriage and civil union in most cases (the bottom slaves would not have the rights to divorce even if they're abused, as it goes against our ancestral culture, they can only be disowned by the Owner), so that in case of an accident at least there would be "familal consent" for hospitals and marital recognition for banks and landlords — although we won't call it marriage.
At the same time, to ensure that this type of relationships do not become more popular, arrangements can be made to cut off the tongue and the toes of the ghetuputra-bottom-slave's all four limbs without anesthesia by handing a knife to the zamidar-top-owner as a ritual which is required for their relationship to be officially recorded in the kazi office.
Thus our culture will be preserved, there will be no room for Western degeneracy, but some security will be given to the gay couples institutionally— a more stable socially engineered future than prostitution, and the ego of the alpha males will be maintained by keeping the bottom gay slaves legally inferior to ordinary men and women in the social hierarchy, with the pain of physical amputation without anesthesia deterring most people away from such lifestyle and thus ensuring that the national birthrate won't fall.

On Forced-Natalism, Rape and Queer victims:

Bangladesh has martial rape legalized. If you're a middle class/upper class cishet, the chances of you getting raped by your married partner without having even a chance at finding justice is higher than suffering it in a random encounter.
The reason there is no movement against legalized marital rape is because the rape of women before their marriage is not tragic to Bangladeshis because of the trauma she suffers but rather because of seeing her as a property of her father which has thus decreased in value for having suffered it— for married women, if they suffer rape after marriage at the hands of anyone other than their husband, the

loss of property value is suffered by her husband and thus it is tragic due to the male-loss. Thus when the husband rapes his wife, the loss of property value does not occur and thus it is not considered tragic.
Similarly, this is why male rape is not taken seriously. Because a male who could not protect himself from a woman or a man is not seen as possessing of value.
Trans women and trans men— due to not having value in either being able to be considered a property through marriage or capable of holding others as property through marriage also do not matter as victims in this context due to the less-than-property more-of-a-disposable-toy status.
The madrasa rape incidents are talked about in liberal circles less due to the trauma of the victim and more because they can be anti-theocratic through the discussion and paint their political opponents as "homosexual" in a derogatory manner (rather than pedophilic and rapist— the discussion in liberal circles always focus on the male-on-male aspect because again, the tragedy is not the victim's trauma but rather the tragedy is in the taboo of sodomy).

The ideology of state and capital and any theology applied to regulate them is one that turns humans into machines and can not ever be capable of seeing people as anything beyond resources to manage efficiently.
It is the ideology that abhors romance because it views romance as a mere prelude to child-making so that it can have more workers and soldiers, even if they have more workers and soldiers than they could ever need, they still demand more future workers and soldiers to be birthed because the abundant supply means paying them lesser wage.
Romance is thus a waste of time and obstacle to maximizing profits for them and must be killed.
Marriage becomes not a recognition of romance realized, but something that can neutralize the romance part and get straight to the baby-making part.
Child marriage hastens child production, and so they support it enthusiastically.
Lgbt relationships become demonized due to the lack of child production.
And women who can not produce babies due to infertility are treated as parasites.
There is nothing more horrific than the world they've built. There is nothing that requires destruction more than this.
One of the key reasons behind homophobia and transphobia is because our relationships do not tend to result in the birth of babies — which is not beneficial

to a ruling class that seeks an unemployed labor force they can underpay due to higher supply of workers. And the impact of this repression doesn't at the end of the day stay contained within the sphere of lgbts. No, eventually, the pro-natalist ideology used to tread upon the lgbts is used also to tread upon cis women who are infertile.
The cannibalism never ends.

The thing that Bangladeshi conservative populists who think they'll perform some sort of a revolution by having as many babies as they can in their lifetime don't realize is that modern warfare doesn't depend on population nor the bravery of masculinity anymore, it's not swords- it's nukes. The capitalists and imperialists won't have any second thoughts before killing your children, be they 12 or 12 million in number with famine and fire. The only way any form of large scale truly anti-establishment movement can work out is if it has mass global working class support but you can't even look at the female working class population of your own country without turning up your nose, so good luck with that.
(Of course, they think the world will suddenly have an EMP event in the future that will render electrically operated weaponry unusable so they think that'll be their time to shine and will use this prophecy as an excuse to funnel gullible youth into making kids without economical sustainability because hey, they want to keep the supply of laborers higher than the demand so they can get away paying low wages. The prophecy of technology going extinct was specifically built after the west's technological advancement made winning war through manpower alone an impossibility. More or less, it's a way to justify rape-camps and treating women like womb-machines and denying troonies and faggots rights. They have lost the functionality of patriarchy, now they have only the pleasure of it left.
They espouse prophecies of technological extinction because they can not otherwise justify their existence in the present world. When manpower alone can't win a war, the forced breeding and control of women becomes harder for them to justify. Unless there is a future coming soon which would enable these activities for them.)

More on Rape:

Liberals approach lgbt people like "why can't you just stay closeted and keep it to yourself instead of asking for legal recognition"
What gets bred in closets? What gets bred in fearsome secrecy? All communities have predators. If a woman gets abused by her husband she can go to her family. Often the family would mistreat her or convince her to go back to him, but she still has at least some fucking people to talk about it to. She has someone to vent about it to. What happens when a gay guy gets abused by his boyfriend? He can't reach out to his family in this structure. If his boyfriend is particularly violent or controlling or the stalker type, he can't even make a report to the authorities without convicting himself. He has no support network even for a moment of respite.
The closet is the lgbt's enemy. And the liberals who treat it as anything different want to perpetuate this dynamic because they can be a tourist and get away with abusing anyone they want every once in a while without even the slightest repercussions.
Like lgbts can't even fucking talk about being abused by their partner without cishet right wingers painting all lgbts as abusers. Some trans girl got held captive and raped/abused for years by her cis boyfriend and when the story broke right wingers framed it as her fault for being transgender. Like do you see how when even the tales of abuse are used to demonize your community you can't even seek out fucking support lines? Because it's not just you who will be victim blamed, in this case your entire community will be *demonized*. They won't just say, you the victim, are responsible for your trauma, they'll say your entire community is predatory and by extension, you the victim are predatory.
Like shit, no wonder this community has such a high fucking suicide rate. It's not just simple victim-*blaming*, it's victim-predatorization.

Animals That You Are

There is an abysmally pathetic trend among Bangladeshi liberals and leftists to claim that "madrasas are filled with gay hujurs", they say this in the flimsy hope of stopping child abuse in madrasa by utilizing homophobia against predators. But if bigotry ever had utility, the trans and intersex children thrown out of home and exiled into hijra communes who are funneled into sex trafficking and child prostitution would've been liberated long before.

Bigotry exists to dominate. The art of domination includes preying on vulnerable children. So the abuse that madrasa children suffer and the abuse impoverished transgender and intersex children suffer is a feature of that bigotry, not a bug. And you can not fix that with the usage of bigotry.

You lot view yourselves as court jesters and tricksters. As if had you the right enough tricks and strategies, that you could change things for the better. Without violence and loss of lives, without suffering and struggle and counter-dominance. That you could lead, what you imagine the ignorant masses, to a revolt where they're confused about what they're revolting against. You view everyone as useful idiots to lather up with the butter of your silver tongue. And all this obsession with trickery keeps you from ever being earnest or having anything genuine to say.

So at the end, the trans and intersex children will continue being raped. And the madrasa boys will continue being raped. Because you wanted to keep playing on and on the game of political correctness that seems edgy to you but is politically correct in the context of Bangladesh. You will never seek to dismantle the system, but make facile jokes not at rapists for being rapists but at rapists for being sodomites. Worthless maggots like Meer Za will claim marital rape against women is mostly anal in Bangladesh, because he thinks there's anything of value to be extracted from that claim. The delusion that politicians would care about banning it on the grounds of sodomy when they care not for vaginal rape. This insipid spinelessness of trying to appeal and appeal and appeal to the disgust factor of conservatives. The delusion of being the trickster. The grinding worthlessness of it. Because insensitivity without correctness is worthless. The problem is not what you percieve to be cool political incorrectness, be politically incorrect. The problem is in your rhetorical incorrectness which you embellish as political incorrectness. You're not politically incorrect, you haven't the guts for it. You play within safe grounds still and act like you're breaking boundaries. You're not the rabid feral animals you fancy yourselves to be, you're domesticated pets having zoomies in the designated playground built by their owner. And I resent you lapdogs, your cutsie useless shakings of tails— at least livestock serve meat.

On the Existing Queer Movement of Bangladesh:

Poor Bangladeshi lgbt people obviously need to survive first. Middle class Bangladeshi lgbt people are like little puppydogs making pitiful teary eyes to get the table scrapes of undefined things like "acceptance" and "tolerance" and an "acknowledgement" of their "humanity" rather than asking for rights. Rich Bangladeshi lgbt people are too degenerate, as any rich people are, to contribute anything to the cause. Most lgbt people are too chickenshit to come out of the closet. And an invisible populace can not ask for its rights any more than the Bigfoot or the Yeti can. And maybe people who are not ready to kill or die for their cause don't deserve to succeed.

The ones who do come out of the closet are too traumatized and too busy having terrible opinions on geo-politics or cannibalizing and shitting on all other lgbt identities than theirs as if to beg "please, not me, I'm one of the good ones, please" to the murderers.

Bangladeshi non-queer progressives who themselves are molded by western culture place the burden of maintaining Bengali culture on lgbt people. While poor lgbt people are thrown out of home, lose educational means and jobs- they wring their hands about whether or not the "concept" of homosexuality is Bangali enough or whether a man loving a man - or woman loving a woman is too western, or perhaps the concept of romantic love itself is too western for them because they benefit from arranged marriage. When trans men and trans women seek hormones to combat gender dysphoria, they whine about capitalism and consumerism and pretend as if these things don't affect all medicines even beyond transition related ones. Trans people who make their own medicines are non-existent to them. These intellectuals don't care about queer people, they care about culture war.

What the Dhakaia queer community's self-proclaimed "leaders" do is staying in silence and secret as long as possible and then whenever any ally or members of their own community raise voices for rights, they shut them down into silence through bullying and proclamations of seniority. There are very few people as pathetic and cowardly as these.

They'll say "cishets shouldn’t speak for us" when allies demand rights, and say some moronic bullshit like "you don't know as much as i do" when other lgbt people demand rights.

Also, the "senior queer leaders" who are still alive and well should stop fucking using Xulhaz Mannan's death as an excuse to be a cowardly rat not only themselves but also trying to infect others with their cowardice.

Activists get murdered all over the world, guess what, they make the informed decision and the choice to die for their cause.
That's their agency at play. And you don't get to stop others from raising their voice because it hurts your wee liddle fee fee to see online backlash from conservatives because again guess fucking what the queers are dying due to this system even right now, and the backlash from raising voice against this system is insignificant compared to the necessity of voices.

Bangladeshi lgbt intellectuals stay closeted, never ask for rights and assume that the social values are a huge insurmountable obstacle without even trying to be out of closet themselves and drive themselves to a state of near-catatonia over social media reactions and handpicked news stories of violence against lgbts without ever trying to interact with society as they are in real life and assume that only the "urban elite liberal sphere" is accepting of lgbts because they never interacted with anyone outside it. When people ask for lgbt rights, they say that social values matter more than law and discourage people from seeking legal change. Thus they maintain the stagnating status quo.
These people live in a cage of their own creation.
And no, I don't give a fuck about Xulhaz or his bf's deaths. Shitload more queers in countries with lgbt-friendly laws have been murdered since then. You can't create a perfect society, you create laws to regulate it.

More on Rich Queers:

When it comes to rich lgbt people, the reality of the adult who owns/controls their wealth and power is different than the ones who merely have connection to wealth and power of their parents, I think.
The first kind, the one who controls and owns the wealth — often becomes a rotten husk of a human being who cannibalizes on and exploits other lgbt people of lower classes. They have a greater capacity to commit abuse and get away with it just like cishet rich people.
However, the later kind of lgbts whose parents are rich, the ones who do not yet and might not ever control and own their parents' wealth themselves- have a higher amount of parental control over their lives if their parents are conservative.

For me, when my relatives or family members disagree with anything I do, I simply brute-force my will and get what I want if it's a crucial enough component of life. The worst they could do is cut off ties with me or throw me out of home. But for rich kids, what the worst their parents or relatives can do goes beyond that due to the power and wealth they possess. If a rich queer gets found out, their family can afford to hire muscles and put them forcefully into asylums. Queer families of lower classes, due to lower amount of wealth have lower power over their brood. There are no rooms that my family or relatives can afford that I could not break out of with pure physical strength. But not so with hyper-wealthy families. The richer you are, the worse and stronger cages can you build for all the people around you. Even if rich kids ran away from abusive households, their abusers have a higher level of access to the resources to recapture them than an ordinary family.

And what happens to these rich queers who get gnawed on by the vultures while they're still alive and are forced to bend to the immense money-fueled will of fillial authority until learning to just accept subjugation and wait for the time they can control and own wealth themselves? What do they become when they get the chance to finally control that wealth? If they don't learn liberation then they learn to imitate these patterns of control and learn how to hammer and weld bars of iron into cages.

When I see wealthy and powerful queers who have the ability to make actual change, I see nothing but hedonistic scum preoccupied with drug-fueled revelries of orgies behind closed doors too well-pleased with their degeneracy to give a shit about civil rights. They have the ability and not the intent. They can afford to be without civil rights. They have the wealth to move abroad, to buy hotel rooms or rent resorts, they have money enough for the closet. They have money enough to bribe through medical care and other problems average lgbts without civil rights face. And so they simply do not give a shit about civil rights. The ones who date their peers are still less than evil. The ones who go after people below their economic circle prefer it that those people are constrained by legal barriers to be easily exploitable. Having the status of a "freak" to them is an exotic spice added to their sex lives rather than something that prevents their survival.

My terroristic conclusion is not born out of my base love for violence. I've seen the future and I'm not in it. I've seen the future and it does not get better with people like us still holding onto survival.

Western Queers/Deshi Queers:

Do you know why western queers fought so hard for their rights and got it? Because they had nowhere else to go. There was no other country for them. So they suffered the hate crimes and the assassinations and the deaths through institutional neglect and homelessness to live their lives openly and fight to get what's fucking theirs.

Bangladeshi queers don't fight as hard because they dream of the west as a safe heaven. Ironically, because the reason the western queers fought so hard is because they had no safe heaven. And now the legal rights they have which is constantly under threat from people like the lgbtphobic American president and ruling party, the lgbtphobic billionaires and western theocrats — the legal rights for which countless proletarian lgbts gave their lives — is now being called "soft imperialism" and "soft capitalism" by non-western lgbtphobic politicians. And their ill-rhetoric kicks down on non-western queers, who chase after the mirage of the lgbt safe heaven in west (which does not exist, western lgbt people are being hate crimed and killed through institutional neglect even now although the legal rights greatly improved their lives) because they now have the illusion of an "option" — the illusion of an "option" which the western queers who fought to get their rights never had.

Bangladeshi queers and allies thus use the deaths of Bangladeshi queers who did fight, like Xulhaz Mannan, to justify their own cowardice. And through this they insult the memory of Xulhaz. The death of Xulhaz is to be emulated, not avoided out of fear.

And so, for a non-terroristic effective queer movement to begin in Bangladesh, queers must recognize these things:

1) The west is not a safe heaven for queers, they too fought and are fighting and are dying for survival and recognition.
2) Lack of institutional and legal recognition is a bigger threat to lgbt people than random hate crimes or murders. Because the system murders lgbt people passively through denial of rights, its murder is invisible and does not register.

For these elements to be recognized queers must be:

1) Caged: Ideally, lgbt-legalized nations will ban the immigration for everyone from Bangladesh. This would force Bangladeshi lgbt people to fight for their rights where they stand instead of trying to escape. Or these nations, like how America has already illegalized trans people from existing in public in many states and are planning on taking away marriage rights, would for a period illegalize lgbt people again. As their nations' lgbt people fight to regain their rights, thus our nations' lgbt people must fight to gain ours without an escape route to a land without battle.
2) Plagued: One of the reasons western queers were able to recognize the necessity of institutional recognition and marriage rights is because institutional injustice had become more visible and heightened during the AIDS pandemic. Although the effects of criminalization and lack of legal marriage rights affects lgbt people of Bangladesh even now, it is not so starkly visible to all of them every day, day after day. To make it visible we need a key event that forces them to realize how the system is killing them. During AIDS this had become apparent to western queers. Every once in a while when lgbt people have to deal with hospital related legal complications, regardless of political spectrum they remember why legal recognition for their relationships and identities are necessary, this is why those that survived HIV/AIDS pandemic and dealt with the legal complications every single day as their loved ones died, tried their hardest to get their rights. Because they had a constant reminder. In Bangladesh, this is why I hope a similar pandemic hits the queer circles, so that all the liberals who intend on spending their lives away in secrecy are reminded of the necessity of fighting to change laws. Because sure they lose their friends and loved ones every once in a while due to passive systemic murder, but this passive murder must be accelerated for its weight to fully dawn on them. They must deal with it every single day. For them to forsake the fear of death, they must see it every day. For them to forsake the fear of losing it all, they must be made to face a smaller apocalypse.

On Cishets Who Say "No Love Under Capitalism"

As you say: undeserving of happiness, slithering on its body, we vile worms feed on dead and rotten humanity. Love a decadent luxury for us maggots, mere vanity.

But you are a maggot too, if maggots we would be. Then why would we allow you your lovers to retain, when our own lovers you would rather have slain? Why would we not enter your home as we burn? If you set us ablaze: how fire does spread you'll learn. On the platforms of your performed hate as fills up the money your enlarged sack, you will find one day, if so too late: some of these queers do bash back.
If the romantic relationships of lgbt people are a mere luxury, then so shall be the relationships of cishet people as well. Set fire to the kazi offices and wedding ceremonies. Kill the husband and leave the wife alive. Kill the wife and leave the husband alive.

On Waiting for Socialist Revolution:

Remember when Bangladeshi leftists were calling lgbt rights ruling class hegemony before — and now that western states are becoming anti-lgbt with world's richest billionaires being anti-lgbt bigots — suddenly they can't bring themselves to call lgbtphobia an example of ruling class hegemony?
That's why terrorism to kill both right wing and left wing intellectuals will be necessary.

Maxim Gorky, whose Mother was one of my favorite novels, to mock fascists, to mock them through emasculation using existing chauvinist ideas had written in a popular proletarian magazine something along the lines of "fascists are all homosexuals, get rid of homosexuals and you will get rid of fascists".
Stalin when he got power, echoing Gorky but now with sincerity and no sense of irony, wrote that homosexuals were inherently fascists. He accused them all of pederasty (he was himself a pedophile), and proceeded to send the androhomosexuals and transvestites, excepting lesbians to prison. Thus they perished starving and gang-raped in captivity.
And so today the anti-throcratic liberals call the pedophile rapist hujurs " homosexual" instead of pedophiles and rapists. Because in our society homosexuality even when consensual and between adults carries a heavier stigma than pedophilia or rape. The liberals present the rhetoric that madrasas, rather than abuse are filled with homosexuality by conflating these two things. And the left deems the fight for lgbt rights to be a "single issue movement" regardless of how

much you tie it to class and geopolitical issues and no matter how much queers fight for other causes too, and thus are careless of the community.
So this land, should an upheaval occur is ripe for exactly the mimicking of the previous dynamic, what Stalin did to lgbts in his regime. And all those cunts you think are your friends and allies shall when you're sent to death will thus proclaim "the current situation is too unstable for us to care." They will call you theocratic because abusive theocrats have been conflated with your kind. And then they will butcher you.
Socialism is the only answer.
But marginalized people have no guarantee that they will get their rights after socialism. They could very possibly be called counter-revolutionaries for raising their voice asking for their rights afterwards if general acceptance of them is not established prior to socialism. Even after Lenin legalized homosexual people, Stalin illegalized them right back after he got power and mass arrests of them occured leading to mass rapes in prison.
So, of course, marginalized people should speak against capitalism and imperialism, but telling marginalized people to speak only regarding those issues without simultaneously asking for their particular rights is brain dead behaviour. A minority working class individual will suffer from both capitalism and also bigotry. This is what many class reductionists don't understand. People in pain must scream and demand their balm.
There is also a problem in calling every bigoted Marxist individual an opportunist. The opportunist abandons his ideals, he is self-centered. He is easier to recognize. But the pragmatist can be selfless, prove himself again and again by sacrifice and view his bigotry or disregard for marginalised people that ends at deaths and massacres as necessary for the greater cause. And they'll have their loyal dogs to call these deaths and oppression "excesses", the scholarly word for "mommie did a whoopsie, ah eto bleh"
Every opportunist views himself as a pragmatist, but not every pragmatist views himself as an opportunist.
I'm not gonna hold my breath for a socialist revolution that might not come before I grow old and die before fighting for the legal rights of my community in present society and present economical system as it exists.

None of those self-proclaimed Bangladeshi leftist cunts like Arif Sohel who claim "they'll handle the lgbt issue according to the country's culture" intend to actually do anything in regards to civil rights.
Their intention is, at best, to make more ghettos and slums to funnel transgender communes into — which will inevitably run rife with child prostitution and drug trafficking — and maybe give minimum wage quota jobs to handful of transgenders — and that's it. No civil rights, just acts of mangled charity.
And these people, if they have power even after a socialist revolution? You won't get your fucking civil rights even then. They'll pull the same fucking shit.
They'll talk up a whole lot about not supporting lgbt marriage because they're marriage abolitionists — while never abolishing marriage for cishets— and while withholding the rights from lgbts — just because the optics of supporting lgbts won't be favorable for them.
They'll demand your community to breathe and speak socialism with every ounce of being while not associating with your civil rights or marriage rights or legal recognition themselves.
So my whole queer terrorist manifesto? It'll be applicable in countries like Bangladesh even in a context different than capitalism. You'll have to murder political leaders in power, be they socialist or capitalist, to get your civil rights.
Remember, even if your lack of civil rights is passively killing your community — it's about just "individual freedom" to moronic fucking pricks, even and particularly to the leftist ones, rather than something that affects the masses— because your community is just too small in number to be considered part of the masses and be politically useful to them.
That's why you can't get your rights peacefully. That's why you need to kill these motherfuckers until they agree to give you civil rights.
The more and more communists try to argue lgbt marriage rights is silly identity-politics-individualist-personal-freedom issue rather than something that is systematically killing people — the more I realize the only way to make them understand is through terrorism. No matter how much explanation or how many essays or societal analyses you write illustrating the ramifications of this systemic denial of civil rights — they will continue to gloss their eyes over it because it is only through violence that the marginalized can make themselves heard.

“But But The Law Won't Be Locally Enforced”

There's no point in whining about whether it will be locally enforced or not when it doesn’t even exist on paper. The law is not the ultimate victory, it's the first step, but you can not use the fear of the steps that come after the first step to argue against or discourage taking the first step. You need to make the law exist on paper as the first step. That's what I'm willing to commit terrorism for.
The enforcement of the law comes later, the first step is instating the law at all. I don't care about whether it's enforced everywhere, because I am mighty enough to enforce it where I live if it exists at all. Because I am capable of fighting, because I'm capable of throwing a fit. The point of laws is like a net, of course people will slip through the crack, but the net needs to exist there at all. These arguments are just a flimsy excuse to not start fighting where one is and dreaming of long to come days instead. The western queers didn’t get their rights handed to them in a platter. In Stonewall riot, they didn’t just throw bricks. They threw lit molotovs as well. They got it paid with blood and deaths. As shall we.

Another Joke for You

My shackled up basement slave tried to crawl out and escape today. I kicked it in the face and told it "Don't you know, Lenin said that under capitalism —freedom exists only for the rich? So there's basically no difference between you and me."

Might is the Root Word in Almighty and Violence is God
The contradiction of the liberal and culturally leftists' approach to queer people — as in insisting that the queer people do not demand marriage rights but live a state of existence unrecognized by law as some of sort of a performance art of marginalization as a romanticised thing — is that such an existence outside of law inherently turns people violent and violent people are quite capable of taking the rights they deem necessary by force.

On Incremental Change:

All the incremental change of America, that disallowed employers from discriminating against black people and women, rolled back by a president in the blink of an eye. All the fight for these incremental changes rendered meaningless with the sweep of a pen.

And so, when the conservative says they hate the indigenous but love the subracial, you may say "fair" and when the conservatives say they're against trans women but support intersex people whom they call "third gender", you say once again "fair", dreaming of the snail paced progress brought about by your facile compromises, but know this: none of it will matter.
None of the dead people will matter.
None of the people you allowed them to demonize in the cost of protecting some others nor a condescending name for them will matter.
Incremental change never will.

A manifesto on the utmost necessity of Queer Terrorism:

The problem is that when you want things to go your way, the question will inevitably come "what happens if it doesn't go your way?" and then you need an answer to give.
The theocrats have an answer in regards to these things. So if your goals have elements that run contradictory to theocrats, you too must have answers to offer.
What happens if they don't let you have what you want?
This answer must not be simply saying "Oh! But not letting me have what I want is immoral!! Oh but it's moral to do this and that!!"
You must actually give them a positive or negative incentive. What happens? And this is the paradox: no legal progress can be achieved for your kind, unless you first violate law and order.

Terrorism is the natural end product of utilitarianism.
If you are a minority, the only way to combat utilitarianism if that is the operating ideology is by creating a collective conscience within your group that recognises that it is their moral obligation to indiscriminately butcher and mutilate people of the majority when you're criminalized or your rights are denied to you — for the sake of preserving their cultural aesthetics or to keep the birth rate number up just by a tiny insignificant minuscule point so they can have more laborers for less wage.
If your people's rights must be denied to you because it doesn't benefit them otherwise — then their rights shall be granted if it harms the majority more greatly to withhold it.

I am aware that I'm completely morally abhorrent, I never claim being a better person than the worst right winger.
The first steps of the terroristic lgbt activities would involve holding petty homophobic and transphobic influencers hostage and forcing them to livestream their readings of already existing fatwas that explain how lgbt people are not condemned by religion according to some interpretations with weapons held to their heads and throats. This is to reach their audience base and is a mere message of desperation.
This would be a warning and nothing more. That is to say, "you had the option to reconcile our existence with your faith, you had the option to allow us civil union rights without betraying your faith"
But they will not choose to accept it.
"And you chose not to accept it."
And so as the crackdown on lgbt people heightens the queer-terrorist activities would hit the next phase. Which is random killings and bombings.
"You chose to deny us security. And thus we take security away from you."
This act of violence would be ineffective at accomplishing my ideological goals, it would kill even people of my community, it'd vilify the community further in people's eyes. But it'd still be an answer to the question "Why should I give a fuck about faggots and trannies' rights to marry when there are worse problems in the world?"
The issue with answering this is that while faggots and trannies die off systemically due to lack of legal marriage or even civil union rights, our community really is too small in the grand scheme of things to matter. To make our concern their concern, to earn their investment in our well-being we need to either make our rights benefit them or make it so that our lack of rights results in loss for them. Because appealing to the humanity of these people is useless. We must become inhumans.
The ruling class needs a constant supply of desperate laborers and soldiers they can underpay. Higher population is thus good for them. They have no reason to give a fuck about relationships that breed no brood. We cannot make our rights beneficial for them beyond the sell of idpol virtue signaling merchandize. And ruling class people who are queers have the wealth to circumvent obstacles arising from the lack of rights so they do not need to care either.

And so the other answer is making our lack of rights be something that causes everyone loss. Your laws have demented my soul, taken away my social security, so I take away from you whichever semblance of security you felt in this state. If fear would be the rag that waterboards my clan, then let you feel it too everyday. Wondering if the train will reach its destination or be violently derailed. Wondering if the building you live in will go up in flames tomorrow. The social contract does not protect me from violation, so I must breach it and make it ineffective at protecting you too. If my Lot is to die for your theological fiction, then your Lot must die for my material reality. Let us revel in dread and uncertainty.

Ideally the places to bomb would have ruling class people in them but they have access to better security technology and so the terrorism would have to be focused on areas which have the convergence of people of all classes.

The result would be introducing a factor of potential disadvantage in performing bigotry against a community for social cookie points whereas before there were no such potential of incurring harm.

I would obviously be executed. And the initial result would be a rise in bigotry for lgbt people. But further bigotry would be good. The lgbt community would have to band up to condemn my actions and organize themselves more well. However the increasing state repression and the destabilized nature of life due to random bombings would cause lgbt people to lose the last few attachments they hold to their lives and ask for their rights with a louder voice.

Ideally anyway. Of course it could go a thousand different ways if I did it — ultimately it's not about whether it will lead to anything good. It would be about making you feel a semblance of the pain and loss which I feel as my kin die off.

Terrorism is the most earnest form of expression in a world of populist liberal and conservative politicians making ineffective shallow compromises and upper class youth who shit on minorities not out of the genuine hatred of their heart but in an effort to feel like they're part of a community through shared hatred.

Not only do I support left wing terrorism, I also support right wing terrorism. If you can actually manage to kill me, if your hate is real enough and earnest enough for you to risk your life by killing me, than all the more power to you- it's better to believe in something and be prepared to kill and die for it rather than using rhetoric to weasel your way into personal benefits.

The conversation is always about the "slippery slopes" and imagining worst case scenarios for the non-marginalized people if the marginalized people are given

more rights. But never the worst case scenarios for the non-marginalized people if the marginalized people are /not/ given more rights. Because when you create the situation where terrorism is not merely a necessary evil but an outright virtue, no amount of security technology can create safety for you. If that's the world you seek to create, if that's the world you are complicit in, that's the world you deserve to live and die in.

There's no way to disprove someone who says lgbts wanting marriage rights is somehow "individualist" because there's no way to prove it either. These arguments have no meaning. It doesn't matter whether it fits someone's definition of collectivism or not. If it's anti-collectivist to get marriage rights, then you keep killing the members of that collective and instruct others to keep killing the collective until your rights are granted so that it becomes *more* anti-collectivist to *deny* your people marriage rights.

This is the simple end result of nonsense pretentious rhetoric.

If you are forced into a social contract which does not recognize you or your family, which criminalizes you— then you're under no obligation to maintain its conditions until it is rewritten. We don't need to "fit in", we need legal rights for marriage and the legal rights to medically transition, and if we don't get them— we kill you.

Rejecting "Marginalised Person" as an Identification Applicable to Me

Those self-identified "queer grassroot leaders" calling for restrain and secrecy in lgbt activism and decrying people speaking out without consulting them— or general intellectual/politician horde, often identifying themselves as leftists , do not apply actual proper class analysis but remain stuck in playing a form of identity politics.

For them, owning private property is not an signifier of class but rather aesthetics are— the openly queer people attempting open nonsecret bold activism become "privileged" not due to ownership of private property or by exploiting others' labor but due to the social conventions they break — due to contradicting these people or being rude to them. Openly queer people are assumed to be rich and thus above the law by them — rather than being openly queer because they have nothing to lose.

Class reductionism done right is better than the form of identity politics which they play.

In Spivak's essay she asked "can the subaltern speak" and Bangladeshi leftists have turned it into an assertive sentence — the subaltern can not speak— and thus anyone who speaks is not qualified as a subaltern. Openly queer people advocating for legal rights are framed as "privileged" and "doing more harm than good" for the queer collective. Anyone breaking social conventions are framed as individualists and since asking for lgbt rights is breaking social conventions, thus the queer activists are individualists and individualism is a very very very no good bad bad word, saar.

However, the downlow queer activists or leaders who call for secrecy and restrain are not promoting active collectivism. They're promoting passive collectivism, passive collectivism which seeks to not make waves but help individuals within the community through charity and access to resources. Which ironically enough can be called a form of individualism itself — queer individuals are getting help through charity— but the system that denies them legal rights collectively is not confronted. For the bourgeoisie, the hierarchy-based society is what grants them power and privilege — and for the proletariat, the hierarchy is the cause of their suffering. Herein lies the contradiction of bourgeois charity — if the goal of charity is to alleviate suffering, then charity must dismantle the hierarchy rather than reinforce it — but that would require the bourgeoisie to act against their class interest — thus bourgeois charity is self-contradictory and can never alleviate suffering in any meaningful way but only exist to reinforce the status quo by being a tool of dominance-assertion for the ruling class which simultaneously frames them as “good people”. And thus passive collectivism is a form of individualism. I could try to argue that I am attempting to mobilisea the community toward collective action as an individual and that even if my actions end up hurting the collective as it always does when lgbt controversy goes viral — that in the long term it will do more good by alleviating systemic oppression and the queer activists now are thinking of short term "good". But that would be rebutted with a simple "ah but you will fail to change legal policies, and so there will only be short term harm without long term good".

In this case, I would not have any particular argument to provide in order to moralize my actions.

And thus I would simply accept accusations of amorality and privilege as a part of what I am and what I do. I will simply identify myself as a knowingly harmful privileged element. The question is what's next? What can you sniveling fuckwads do after that — beyond having me arrested or killing me? I accept death. I have walked into places as bombs were being thrown. I have walked toward gunfires with nothing but bricks in my hands. I have been beaten and raped as a joke. What can you do to me that has not been done? Mine is the privilege of being Death incarnate. I moralize none of my actions— I ask no pity for what might happen to me. I preach violence for the sake of violence— conflict for the sake of conflict— whether it's sustainable or effective does not matter to me. My complete agency and its negative consequences I fully accept. Cower before my omnipotence and repent.

Whamen

(I had written the part about feminists needing to commit vigilantism to acquire better civil rights for women before the recent recommendations to the penal code. Anything similar to this however, is not a privilege queer people will get to afford.)

Legalized child marriage is legalized slavery. And it should be dealt with the same violence of the anti-slavery revolutions.
Women actually could get a lot of their rights by mass organizing and unionizing and striking in richer countries. Unlike lgbts, whose striking would be ineffective due to being too small in number, women have the number to make it effective. But that method might not work in Bangladesh. The problem with non-terroristic methods of trying to achieve female rights like equal distribution of inheritance/ban of marital rape/ban of child marriage is that most female workers in Bangladesh are simply too poor to continue any strike like that without damaging their livelihood because the high density population means the supply of workers exceeds the demand of workers and can always be put through an ever-revolving door.
And this is why female terrorism would instead be necessary to acquire those demands, because it can be achieved with a fewer number of activists.

It's the same logic as queer terrorism. The status quo does not benefit from giving you your rights, so you must cause it loss for not giving you your rights. Since you can't do it through striking, you do it through terrorism.

Rage

I love angry people. Genuine anger, not feigned and flimsy moral outrage coated in milquetoast humour against the agency of the marginalised. The anger doesn't have to be morally correct or even directed to the right people, it can come from a right winger even. But it needs to be genuine enough to be as destructive to themselves as it is to others.
They know about rage, the cishets.
Killing queers, imprisoning queers is fine. Because of the cishets' rage. Their rage at western military and capitalism — which the wider queer community, as much a part of the third world and the proletariat as cishets, is associated to by cishets through some strange alchemy.
So their rage is thus justified. All the blood is thus justified. The queers thrown off roofs, beheaded, butchered — thus deserve to die. Even as the western proletariat queers get imprisoned in wrongful convictions to suffer v-coding. Even as the western proletariat queers die homeless and starving after being kicked out by their families, even as the western queers are lynched by western cishets too. Because the third world cishets feel rage at the west and capitalism, killing third world queers is thus justified according to some self-proclaimed leftists.
This is why, you see, third world queers must learn to feel rage and transform this rage into destruction. Because in this world the only way you assert your humanity is not by making appeals to humanity — but through violence. So if it is rage that justifies their killings, it is rage that shall justify your killings of them in turn.
Cishet men get so many documentaries examining the reason behind their extremism precisely because they commit violence. Leftists are so sympathetic in understanding theocratic violence precisely because it damages lives. For the strife of your people to be understood: if you are a marginalized people with no power, you need that violence to platform your kin. You need to go out and hurt people.

You Don't Deserve an Explanation

We live in a post-truth world. No amount of scientific justification or religious explanation will compel those who benefit from keeping lgbt people within a low station in society to give us our marriage rights or to decriminalize us. There are plenty of those and yet we continue to toil in misery.
Our legal rights must not be sought out through appeals to humanity, explanations or justifications. They must be sought out through violence. If you don't let us build our homes we will destroy yours. It really is as simple as that.
In a post-truth world there is no truth greater than one which mutilates bodies and destroys properties.

The Ticking Ticking Annihilation Bomb

The world has very little time left due to climate change.
Even in its dying moments, the people in power refuse to decriminalise lgbt people and let you marry your loved one purely to maintain their meaningless dominance. Even as the world dies around them due to their actions they refuse to let go of their chokehold on your throat.
Does this not boil your blood like the seas they've boiled? In your last few years, do you not want to kill back these fucking pigs who have denied and wrenched away the last remnants of happiness from you?
Do you not want to introduce them to nothingness, they who have destroyed and continue to destroy all attempts of you who have nothing trying to have the nothing you could have?

this could've been avoided

We could've been a part of you.
Instead you chose to act like we're an invasive force.
You chose to act like we are pawns of the west even as the western ruling class crushed its own queers.
Even as we died off under the feet of capital and colonialism, you chose to act like we are backed by some foreign power. You chose to act like the victims of the same drone bombs that kill us too can be avenged in turn by killing us even more.

Instead of giving us rights you acted as if our oppression will magically defeat the west.
You treated us like a sacrifice to the altar of your culture. You acted like it's a moral obligation for us to die off without rights, if not to live miserable lives. You destroyed our peaceful attempts at acquiring rights. You kept asking us to be the bigger people while killing us.
If this dominance is all it boils down too, if we are to be killable regardless of what we do or do not do— then we shall be killers in turn.

Beyond NGO Buzzwords

Civility, diplomacy, human rights, compassion, mercy, sympathy, empathy, morality, conscience— these are not buzzwords I believe in. I don't use these in the battle for legal constitutional lgbt rights. Instead I appeal to our baser natures. The only way you can afford your security is by giving us marriage or civil union rights— or you embrace instead mutual destruction and an unending instability through continuous terror attacks from queers. Because queers are not an ethnic group dependant on reproduction to refill our ranks, it is impossible to effectively ever wipe us out. While this is an appealing feature for despots who seek to use queerphobia as a forever-tool to compel the masses to self-police and in turn normalize the police state — should queer terrorism as an idea to acquire rights spread far and wide— the consequence of their queerphobia will metastasize beyond their control. They will have a truly unwinnable forever war in their hands until they give up and allow us our rights for marriage.
So I don't care about the debate of ethics or morality regarding lgbt people. Debates about whether lgbt rights are ethical or not. Only theory I care about is the theory of terrorism. In which it doesn't matter whether one views lgbts as ethical or unethical. Because if the law doesn't allow us to marry each other or take hormones/diverge from gender expression etc then we simply go on a killing spree until the law is made to change out of the self-interest of the cishets. What I care about are policies that allow us to exist regardless of this unending debate of whether we are moral or not.
A transgender man died recently from an accident. He couldn't get on life support because his partner was not recognized by law and thus could not give medical consent.

You see, this was the event that broke my psyche. Because at the end of the day, laws determine our ability to survive.
So if you hate lgbts, you can hate lgbts. But we need legal marriage rights and legal gender recognition to survive. So at the end of the day, whether you hate or disapprove of us doesn't matter to me, if your child seems to be gay or trans I wouldn't care if you beat it every day to try to change its identity as long it stays under your care. But those of us who survive to adulthood, we need our marriage rights and decriminalization and legalization. Because it's a matter of our existence. So if you won't give it to us, then you must execute us, because if you neither execute us and nor give us our legal rights — then we shall fight you until you choose either of the options.

No Sunsets for Your Lot

Hope can be a shitty thing sometimes. When you're getting kicked in the belly, sometimes it can stop you from hitting back the person kicking you in the hope your passivity will arouse a sense of sympathy in them and make them stop. That hope is the other side of the fear that hitting the person hitting you will make them hit you more. People talk about crippling dread, but hope can be crippling too. There is the sort of despair that snuffs out all your energy and leaves you a living corpse and there is the type that motivates you into action with the intent of going down swinging. Can't escape despair as much as choose which kind to give yourself into.
People talk about how the state of the world should "radicalize your rather than lead you to despair" but you can't get radicalized without being chin deep in despair, honestly. The kind of change the world needs right now can only be brought in by a mass movement of suicidal and desperate working class people ready to go down swinging. But we're all dreaming that things might get better. And we won't do the things that need to be done until we give up on that dream. Until we start to truly, properly despair.
Genocides against queers can never be permanent -but only perpetual- because we don't repopulate like ethnic minorities from ancestors to descendants.
Unfortunately this also means we will never have a permanent diaspora. You can't ever move all the queers abroad to a comparatively safe zone or whatever because they will just repopulate the next generation.

So the only possible option to leave a better world for the future is improving the ground where you stand on. Because you'll never be able to take all your people away. You will never be Moses. All your people will become enslaved once more, the Pharaoh can never let them go. And so you must kill the Pharaoh.

Reject Safe Spaces

Fascism comes to Bangladesh under the guise of creating safe spaces.
There is no greater joke for Bangladeshi lgbt people than the phrase "safe space". You can have no safe space in a nation which laws criminalize you, disallows you from having marriage or civil union rights, disallows your loved one the consent to put you on life support or bury you. Safe space is then a boiling water at best which cooks you and you can not tell because the flames are out of your sight.
The only real safety is in the weapon of your hand.
You must reject the illusion of safe spaces. You must reject incremental change. It has to be accelerationism on either direction.
It's a fucking joke seeing cowardly senior lgbt leaders unironically trying to fearmonger against the idea of lgbts coming out of the closet and demanding legal rights despite knowing how many lgbt people closeted and out of closet were out there in the streets during July already acquainted with the bloodbath and now don't even have any future social or legal security to mentally recover from it or find a sense of normalcy through a domestic life that their straight and cis counterparts have and thus have no reason to fear loss of life or violence.
I have stood against people with guns and bombs, what fear do I have against blades?
What do I have to look forward to — other than either domesticity or death?

Don't Kill Yourself Without Killing a Conservative or Capitalist First

I get wanting to die. Most queers are heavily traumatised from systemic abuse. However, conservatives will just make fun of the 40% suicide statistics if you kill yourself. Don't do that. If you really want an escape from the pain, from the oppression, from the dead end wall your back has been pushed into, with no hope of a future where you can build a family with someone you love thus your life having been robbed off meaning — then if you seek death, try dying in the process

of doing a suicide bombing. Target a conservative and/or capitalist. Kill them. That'd leave a net positive impact on the world. And it'll be harder for oppressors who have their lives easy and have legal rights to make fun of your suicide then because they could always be the next motherfucker to get targeted.

You Who are Queer and Think I will Worsen Your Life

Bangladeshis are scared. We are so very scared. Whenever influencers like Monica Kabir come along we say "but her individual actions will worsen things for regular girls! She should stop!" When people like Hochemin (much as I hate her from the depths of my guts) come along we say "but her individual actions will worsen things for regular trans women! She should stop!" but really, if a single individual's actions can make things worse for an entire community? Then that community was never in a good position.
You're not scared of things being worse. You're just scared of your blindfold being taken off. You're just scared of seeing what's already there instead of being able to be a camel hiding your face under the sand. You don't deserve that mental peace. You deserve to have it robbed.

People say "there are steps to progress, and this individual or that individual is skipping them and that is bad". But no, it's not about skipping steps, there are no steps. There is no strategy. There is no plan. People just say that as a vague gesturing at the idea of "this and that is too far and we should wait a few thousand years before this and that". It's meaningless airy words to hide insecurity. And it doesn't matter who bears the burnt of it. Go through destruction. If one's actions can cause such a huge chain reaction then the fear of the chain reaction must be overcome by going through it. Stop being such a scaredy cat.

The silliest argument people use in favor of asking queer activists to stay silent is "there are lots of closeted queers who don't want the fight for rights. They just want to live their lives."

This turns a fight for civil rights into base identity politics. If a closeted queer doesn't want its rights then it simply doesn't matter as a person who is worthy of being cared about. Why should I care about some dipshit who keeps it low-key

who finds annoyance at queers that want rights instead of solidarity because it has to deal with hateful memes for a week online when it opens its phone?
They exist in a status quo that's inherently terrible. If the status quo is more bearable to them than the fight to change it then they don't deserve to have their peace. Peace must be broken. More need to die. Progress is made through death. I need to get hate crimed. You need to get hate crimed. We all need to get hate crimed. If that's what it takes to keep the conflict going. Because conflict is better than meek stagnation.
Do you know how many queers just kill themselves? How many die due to institutional reasons, due to not having legal rights, passively? So one or two dead bodies that are victims of active murder don't make a difference. If you want an omelette, eggs must get cracked. And maybe you don't want an omelette but I do, because I'm starving. I only care about people who want change. Not meek ones who are fine with the way things are. So if they seek to wallow in meekness then they deserve what they've got coming to them. Because this is the system that pushes trans kids toward prostitution. This is the lack of marriage rights that leads to trans women and trans men dying lonely in hospitals without a visit from their partners. So if someone is just a neutral meek person then I don't care about their peace. If they're closeted then they don't face as much problems as most uncloseted queers- (which tend to generally be trans people due to dysphoria forcing them out of closet btw, there's a reason historically trans people have always been at the forefront of queer rights movements, not because we are inherently good and brave and stunning people, but because we have no option but to fight). So if the fight for rights worsens some closet cases' lives, be they trans or cis, or even if they're out of closet— then so be it. You didn't ask to be born into a bigoted system but you still are here. You simply bear through it. So even if you didn't ask for your rights, we who care about it will still fight for them and you will simply have to bear through it or perish.

Your Existence isn't Revolutionary

Your continuous life or mere existence if you're lgbt actually /IS *NOT*/ a middle finger to the status quo in itself.
Because the ruling class only acts like they want you dead.
They actually don't.

They want instead for you to suffer perpetually.
They *want* you to exist, but barely, beneath their feet in the social hierarchy, so they can feel like they're above someone else. So they can feel like they're *better*, so they can continue to exploit you.
If your whole community died, if all the marginalized people died, these people wouldn't know what to do with themselves, they would have to create divides within themselves just to stand on the top of someone else.
Your mere existence, such is why, is not revolutionary in itself— until you start doing activities that can directly destabilize their foothold on the pyramid of social hierarchies. Until you demand the rights that would get you out from under their feet. Until you fucking murder them.

STOP FUCKING WHINNING ABOUT XULHAZ AND DO SOMETHING

More queers in Bangladesh have died from lack of systemic legal recognition and the lack of civil rights than they have died from hate crimes for advocating for their civil rights.
Queers die from hate crimes in countries with lgbt friendly laws too. The only difference is Bangladeshis use the deaths of Xulhaz and his partner as the unending sob story and scareshow instead of keeping on fighting. Do I come across as crass? Do I seem disrespectful to the weight of their deaths? Because their deaths have already been made weightless by people who used it as an excuse to give up the fight.
Anyway Bangladeshi lgbts who seek to apply for asylum abroad probably have a vested interest in keeping the country's anti-lgbt laws unchanged, just saying.

Oh I know You Limpdicks Who'll Say I'm Applying a Western Lense Yadda Yadda

People love to talk about how "right wing/left wing" discussions apply to the first world but not the third world but these people point at the aesthetics of politics rather than the essence of it to proclaim the politics of BD can't be understand through this right/left framework but really? At the end of the day all politics of bourgeoisie are right wing and all politics of the working class are left wing. To act like our parties' politics don't dance to the tune of military and capital is ridiculous.

And the tune of capital is played all over the world. These declarations of difference almost feel like a trick to keep the global working class from forming solidarity. We are no different creatures.

They called you western bougie agents as your people died in both the sphere. As the west vehemently shuns your people they still call your people western bougie agents. Your people fought to overthrow the Awami League regime along with them and they proceeded to clamp their eyes and ears shut and call you the agents of Leaguers. If you fight to establish their religious feudalism or if you fight to bring about socialism along with them— they will still continue to proclaim you as the agents of whichever ideology they hate in the next system too. The only course of action is to get your rights now, before another social upheaval. Get your rights and establish your place in society and integrate yourself with them. Make it so that when the next time another upheaval comes, your kin will be their brothers and sisters and mentors and friends — and be so openly. Make it so that uprooting you is impossible without uprooting themselves.

It's not about Sexual Liberation

A certain sort of liberals have boiled the question of homosexuals and transgenders into the legality of the "acts" one *does* rather than who or what one *is*. The question of homo and trans marriage rights thus becomes a question of "sexual liberation" rather than existential and economical security for us. Because sexual liberation holds interest to the liberals as some sort of a distant future concept, but our present survival does not.
The question of whether we are allowed to build a life with our partner gets turned into a voyeuristic question of sexual acts. Being gets turned into doing. Existence becomes recreation— and in this framing of our existence as recreational — leftists are afforded the leeway to decry our existence because we are mere recreational acts in their eyes and recreation has no space in poverty.
Thus the transgender people are doubly condemned, because they view the whole of queerness as "things people do", so "being transgender" becomes "performing transgenderity" and because we shape our body according to our identity, because our existence is undeniable unlike the closeted homosexuals — we then come to

represent to liberal and leftists' minds a perpetual recreation. A people engaged in forever decadence.
This is why even as most of us die in slums as prostitutes — to the liberals and leftists' eyes we represent mere "culture war" with no bearing on class or economy — because we are after all mere eternal performers.

The Tea

Bangladeshi trans community is haunted by the prurience of cis people who want "the tea" or an "insider knowledge" or a "truth beneath the surface" — who are willing, if they lack such gossip, to take anything else other than the truth that might fit their pre-existing views.
For conservatives this manifests in trans women being people who are "not hijra enough" and for liberals this manifests in trans women being "gay men who are too gay".
And so for the conservative "the tea" becomes "trans women are pretending to be hijras" and for the liberal (even the self-proclaimed allies) the tea becomes "gay men are pretending to be women". For conservatives, trans women are false hijras seeking some imagined material benefits and for liberals trans women are gay men in drag seeking social acceptance through falsehood.
If the trans woman goes through physical transformation — the "tea" is that she is brainwashed and has mutilated herself. If the trans woman does not go through physical transformation the "tea" is that she is faking being trans for some sort of imagined advantage.
These often contradictory ideological views can be held by the same person because there is no ideology in this as much as the titillation of "having the tea". Anything that resembles "insider knowledge" becomes the truth as long as there are twists and turns to the story.
I think the problem is in that you can combat false rhetoric. You can combat ideas or concepts that have contradictions within themselves. But you can not combat the tea. You can not disprove the tea. You can not deconstruct the tea. Because the tea exists to entertain and titillate.
You can turn Hegelian theories right side up. You can't turn a Dan Brown book right side up because it does not have the sufficient substance.

I guess what I'm thinking about is the act of laying claim to different identities as an act of solidarity.
Sure, in a homophobic space I will proudly call myself a gay man if it pisses off enough conservatives as an act of solidarity.
But when it comes to shaping laws and constitution — beyond marriage rights, the medical facilities and other methods of combating dysphoria most trans people would require would diverge the community from homosexuals.
A lot of Bangladeshi right wingers are under the presumption that referring to me as a gay boy would upset me or something. Not so!
The reason western trans women of similar politics as me resist to being perceived as such is due to homosexual people being comparatively more accepted than transgender people there.
As Bangladesh has no acceptability for either homosexuals and nor transgenders— then I have no problem with being categorized as such by my political enemy, for I seek not to be palatable by those unto whom I seek to lavish much harm.
I resist such categorization only from Bengali liberals or left wingers of humanist aesthetics due to their self-satisfied smug claim over pacifism and rationality while perpetuating misguided harm. But the resistance to mislabel is very much there and is existant when it relates to liberals.
Often I send expressions of violence to these transphobic liberals and they say "How dare you say I'm homophobic, I'm friends with this and that lesbian and this and that gay man."
Of course you are— I'm accusing you of being transphobe, not of being a homophobe. And the tea that interests you so shall be poured unto you scalding hot, because in the politics of whispered telltales only the fist may rule.

"Poor People Can't be Queer— Hijra Prostitutes in Slums Don't Count"

There was a film Exterminating Angel where a bourgeoisie character speculates that poor people simply biologically feel less pain. (This stereotype is so prevalent it even hampers the medical care poor people receive and fucks them over according to a study published in the Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*).
Our "anticapitalist" "intellectuals" too often spread such similar dehumanizing rhetorics in the name of "solidarity". Because after all, writing against the thievery of surplus value of labor or for private property to be abolished would require too

much effort. So we are left with the গরুর রচনা and the অভ্রচটি about consumerism and pseudopsychoanalysis।
When they feel like railing against "big pherma", they proclaim rural poor people don't have mental illnesses or mental disabilities and such ailments are ones the bourgeoisie are solely affected by. Rural houses are filled with suicides and self-harm, but sure fuckhead, the child who threw itself into the communal pond and karked it with lungs full of mossy water was not dealing with any mental problem whatsoever. You can see the fake reverence of the rural poor as "untainted" or "uncomplicated" all over the fucking dehumanizing slop Bangu intellectual sphere shoots out of their tiny little dicks. "সরল সোজা চাষাভুষা", তোরে একশো টন ইসুবগুলের ভূষি খাওয়াইয়া তোর পাকস্থলী ফাটাইমু, কুত্তার জাত।
They claim, if they recognize lgbt people as capable of romantically loving each other at all rather than it being purely sexual acts—that things such as "love and affection" are not for the poor — and thus lgbt rights are meaningless in Bangladesh. See? These animals first will take away the value of your labor, they will take away the recognition that you have a complex enough mind at all for it to feel anything beyond "yes sir, no sir, me very happy sir" to be afflicted with mental illness, and then they'll take away the recognition that you possess the capability to love someone at all much less of your own gender. They'll dehumanize you, and worse they'll de-animalize you — because even animals are capable of forming relationships and relationships among other animals of the same gender. They will make you something worse than animals, they will make you a pulp of meat grinded up among other pulps of meat. And they will proclaim how much they pity you as they chew on your existence and swallow it down.

To Go Batshit and Bataille for a Moment: Homosexuals and Transgenders are a Designated Human Blood Sacrifice Group on the Temple Altar of Anti-imperialism, Socialism, Feminism and the Economy

I've gone at length in my manifesto about how the denial of lgbt marriage rights is killing and putting lgbt people on an early grave systemically. So when our legal rights would require no state funds to be wasted, why are we denied it?
Liberals posit that our issues are secondary to anti-imperialism, socialism, feminism and macroeconomics in general —often portraying us as an obstacle to these things even. They condemn the NGO queers, but they never empower the

voices of the non-NGO queers. They condemn BAL queers, but never embolden the voices of the queers who fought in the streets in July, supported it intellectually and in the background with resources. They claim queers must remain silent until patriarchy is destroyed and women are at equal standing with men and make no progress in feminism either beyond shallow wins. They claim that queer rights are impossible in a poor country and that queers are all rich while poor queers bear the double burden of class and queerphobia.
So the question comes— decades of lgbts prostituting away and dying —and have you managed to make a dent on the American empire? Has socialism been established in your country? Has feminism made strides? Has the economy been bolstered in the absence of lgbt rights as we died like dogs?
So, their opposition to queer rights is obviously not rational. And in this irrationality do we find their faith — that if they systemically lavish onto enough of us passive deaths that their cause will be bolstered. As if we are the human sacrifices to the gods of Feminism, Socialism, Economy and Anti-imperialism.
No, this is a fine view to have. I'm not critiquing it, merely describing it. So why are their gods not listening to their prayers? I posit this is because queer lives cut short by systemic denial has cheapened our blood and flesh so much that we hold no longer any value as human sacrifices. My suggestion to these leftists and liberals would then be to sacrifice their own family members and children to this cause.
Be Agamemnon. Be victorious. And may the knives of the Clytemnestras spare ye.

On the Futility of My Future Actions:

"nooo, you're engaging in reckless individualist adventurism. Nothing good will come of this."

I am aware of and am honest about the futility of my insignificant actions. I'm prepared to perish for petty things. You lot of "allies" however, who pretend to be knowledgeable or level-headed or possessing of a plan for queer liberation are not honest. Your plans are these:

1) Mocking homophobes and transphobes by stating that they're themselves closeted lgbts online.

2) Calling chatters about lgbt issues "meaningless culture war" under the assumption it will dissuade the right wing from engaging in queerphobia rather than dissuading the left from caring about queer oppression

3) Claim that legal rights of queers don't matter, and criminalized queers without legal recognition as they die off due to the lack of ability to build families that can mutually aid each other due to institutional regulation against non-legally-recognized relationships should instead work on changing the "hearts and minds" of addlepated morons stuck in their ways

4) Mis-conflating pedophilia prominent in religious institutions with homosexuality in order to mock religious institutions and call them "hypocritical"

5) Posting about monarchs who had underage sex slave boys they raped, hoping in this way to make people think queerness is part of "history" and "culture" - rather than refusing the demand for historical cultural examples, recognizing that most healthy non-abusive proletariat lgbt relationships in the historical past would have been destroyed by the ravages of time if not destroyed intentionally

6) Inboxing me Mawlana Vasani quote about the futility in caring about every injustice of the world without anticapitalist and anti-imperialist critique because most of my posts fly over your moronic head too much for you to realize I constantly approach queer issues from a class-related perspective.

7) Being under the impression that semantic exercises of coming up with different words for lgbt people will earn our liberation. That calling trans women third gender will somehow convince conservatives to "accept" us. Rather than realizing that that's fucking moronic

8) Creating sequestered ghettos for trans women where we just get slowly and systemically murdered

9) using examples of a few trans women studying in universities to claim Bangladesh has made strides in progress

10) asking one lgbt identity to cannibalize on another lgbt identity, to put down their own kin under the moronic assumption it will redeem them in the eyes of the right wing

11) Using Alan Turing/Oscar Wilde as example of good lgbts who kept to themselves (literally died due to homophobic legal punishment but you fuck-turds think that's worth emulating)

12) Telling queers to wait until the fall of capitalism to voice their desire for rights while the lack of it actively kills them with no guarantee that a socialist state would not persecute them just like Soviet Union did if queer rights are not fought for concurrently to workers' rights

13) Telling queers to not care about labels or identify as lgbt because "queer acts don't need to turn into identities" because you are a moron who thinks of homosexuality as inherently tied to the sexual acts rather than being about actual relationships centered around love and cohabitation— the denial and repression of which requires identities to form as resistance.

You are not in any way possessing of an actual plan that goes beyond crowing on about airy things like social acceptance and spreading pity porno making appeals to the humanity of conservatives dispossessing humanity. I would rather die meaninglessly than associate with your brand of bullshit cowardly allyship. And I ask no sympathy from the likes of you, nor hold any sympathy for you.

The point of terrorism is in being the stick to the carrot. When we do terrorism a stronger and more earnest pacifist movement of queers will naturally emerge. While condemning us, the ruling class will negotiate with the pacifist section of us, which the ruling class won't do in the current climate due to having nothing to gain from doing so. When they're given something to lose from not doing so— then will they feel compelled. This is how every peaceful activism ever that existed and achieved anything has worked out. There is always to the fox of pacifists, an accompanying tiger of terrorists like the fable.

Every peaceful avenue to get queer rights has been tried and failed in Bangladesh. Writers got killed or had their books removed from shelves, people who tried to be politicians were thrown away.
So tell me, what is left other than violent solutions and terrorism to fight for legal rights? Terrorism is so far the only thing that hasn't been tried. I'm not shitposting, I'm not making grand statements, it's objectively, undeniably the only thing we haven't tried so far.

Things for us are not tolerable. And one must revolt when things are intolerable. The only reason I am alive and am (relatively) mentally well rn is because I broke the law/did legally shady shit in various instances while also being educated and well researched enough to avoid the more dangerous pitfalls. Like, I'm not a normal person and most people from the same background as me wouldn't survive as much or flourish as much under the same legal framework or have their sanity intact.
I'm not saying this to brag, I'm saying this to say that my existence does not represent legal progress. I'm not an example of legal progress.
I'm saying that just because a handful of people *might* survive somewhat and make through it doesn't mean most of the people will. So you need to change the laws instead of pointing at the handful of people who survive through pure dumb luck to say "See? Things are tolerable law-wise." Things are not tolerable and more of us are dying from lack of legal rights than we will ever die from hate crimes for advocating for those legal rights.

In my opinion, one does not truly believe in a cause if one is not prepared to die for it. I'm willing to and have prepared myself to eventually be killed for being lgbt. Most people who want to deny trans people transition facilities, legal recognition or lgbt people the marriage rights are not prepared to die for the cause of denying those things to us, because after all these things don't really directly impact them much. Nonetheless- their belief-less efforts for lgbtphobic causes, often originating from having the same acceptable opinion as the next person, often originating from an attempt to fit in - manages to cause harm due to the majority of their numbers. This is the most depressing aspect of lgbtphobia, a dispassionate disregard is enough to deny you a family of your own. Hence the dispassionate disregard of the

upper middle class and rich must be turned into something else. It must be turned into fear.
In fact, since I'm trying my best to get killed, if i end up succeeding in finding death, do not present any rhetorics that ask people to sympathize with me, that'd not jive with my edgelord extremist era. Acknowledge that I've made my decisions in sound mind and move on. I make no appeals to the humanity of inhumans.
I would demand no justice from a state which laws criminalize my kind and deny us the rights to marriage— I would rather have my active murderers walk free than be punished by the system that murders us passively. Active murder is an honest murder and thus deserves respect, passive murder is far more sinister.
The reason I'm half as well read or eloquent as I am is because I had to constantly read up on theories and concepts to counter the ones used by right wingers to demonize lgbt people just for the sake of myself to justify my own existence to myself. I'd have much rather been a mediocre doormat. Instead now I am a joyless terrorist-wannabe who knows even the dream of having a low wage job and marrying a man i spend the rest of my life with in a low rent apartment eating potato mash for 60 years is not achievable without armed revolution.
All I ever wanted was the legal rights to build a family with a man. You shall not give me that. So I have no reason to keep going. But I don't intend to go down alone. I shall go down with you and your lot.
It's not about whether my existence is ethical, it's not about whether I deserve to exist, it's not about whether religion or science justifies my existence— but that I do exist — and I do seek legal recognition for my marriage and for my decriminalization — and if I can not have it I will destroy everything, and that you can not destroy me in any meaningful way because lgbt people will reappear in your homes the next generation and they will follow my example of destruction, and you cannot have peace and security without granting it to us.
I lose members of my community to passive systemic violence that results in their demise in lonely deathbeds left unattended by their closeted partners too scared to come out. It's a mad unjust world and the only sane course of action is to return it with the same unjust madness and disregard for innocent lives it has bestowed on my people. The liberals don't give a shit about us and the leftists see our plight as culture war and the climate change will kill us all in two decades and I can't, in the last few years of my life left to me, after all the violence, after all the fights I fought for this country in July, the life risks I took — I can't even experience a

moment of sunset with a husband, sit with him in a park for a picnic, hold his hand in public, rest my head on his shoulder— while the libleft cunts tell me marriage doesn't matter and legalization doesn't matter while they themselves marry and the leftist dickless spineless gutless worms call the lgbt community consumerist or bourgeoise or colonizers of western hegemony — as the feminists act like trans women were part of patriarchy before transitioning as if we weren't put through psychological, physical and sexual torture since childhood for acting feminine when the concepts of masculinity and femininity weren't even distinct to us and thus it is acceptable to mock and deride us as long as done from a feminist talking point — and there is no political organized fight for my kin— why would I not be angry? My anger or madness is not irrational, it's the state of mind I logically decided to arrive on. I trained myself to think of physical pain as a mere emotion that can be not felt in order to deal with the pain of beatings and stone-peltings and other forms of physical abuse. I am an extremely controlled individual. I do not feel anything that I do not want to feel, I do not think anything that I do not want to think, I have decided under cold consideration, that having left no peaceful methods of furthering or acquiring rights for this people, the only option left is violence and death.

We are an endless horde. If we are to be monsters before committing you harm, then we shall be monsters afterwards. If we are marked as the destroyers of your civilization as your civilization crushes us — then we shall fulfill your accusing prophecy.

I'm head up my ass about lgbt rights because we no longer live in the days of "Don't ask don't tell".

We cannot live in peace. They destroy hijra slums. They incorporate hijra people as a slur in political slogans against enemies who have nothing to do with hijra people. They see lgbt symbolism in every innocuous thing from triangles and eyes to unicorns to multicolored wall paintings and cause regular ruckus about it. Both the liberals and conservatives alike routinely drag up and make claims of each other being homosexuals and transgenders in a countey where neither of these groups have any rights or decriminalization.

On a material level I have no future. I can not marry, I cannot take loans from banks with my partner's signature, I cannot share an apartment with my partner, I cannot have my partner consent to my surgery or my burial — all of this because I

do not have marriage rights. Because my existence is illegalized I cannot report if I'm raped, I cannot report if I suffer domestic violence.

Fine, okay, maybe I can still live, but what of my psyche? What does growing up beibg sexually assaulted as a ironic performance — being routinely portrayed as debauched — being routinely the victim but always portrayed as predators in media do to our psyche? I dehydrate because the media says trans and gay people are predators to whom both men and women are prey, so I avoid using restrooms for the sake of allowing others to feel comfort in my day to day life. I feel uncomfortable when people even touch me because I grew up being assaulted as a joke and the media tells me my people are predatory and we're "grooming" others by just existing so I feel like I'm somehow a corrupting force. People think I shrink from them because I find them filthy but I am made to view myself as an inherently corruptive force by constant media propaganda. I feel like I'm sullying others when they even touch me.

I exist in a country where gay and trans people are not even decriminalized nor have the basic marriage rights but the upper class scaremongers about trans women entering women's sports as if we're a western country.

I exist in a country where lgbt people are routinely dying due to the society engineered by our lack of marriage rights and big brained leftist intellectuals are reading bell hooks and 80s philosophers to declare "marriage is a bad institution, lgbts shouldn’t seek it" as we die.

What do I have in this construct? I have no material future, I have no psychological peace. I am not being allowed the peace of forgetting that lgbts exist, that I exist, because the media constantly pulls us out, people in real life constantly pull us out to use in their propaganda.

If I cannot have a material future — if I cannot even be a wageslave and live with a husband in a shitty apartment and eat shitty food until I grow old— if I cannot even have psychological peace of silence away from hearing conservatives see the lgbt agenda in non-existent things, if I have to see my lgbt friends routinely get funneled into prostitution or getting sexually trafficked by a ruling class that takes advantage of our illegal status and ultimately fucking kill themselves if they don't die from diseases, if leftists have no intention to change this situation because they see us as western or bourgeoisie or at best "people who need sympathy, but not legal civil rights", if I cannot even kill myself without my suicide being used to demonize my community with fourty percent suicide statistics joke, then why

shouldn’t I yell about why it fucking hurts, how it fucking hurts and that how it will never stop fucking hurting and call for violence until either the cops or the military or a lone conservative vigilante does me a favor and fucking kills me? I'm a dog seeking euthanasia. I just want to go, man. But I don't wanna do it myself. My biggest regret is not trying harder to get killed during July. My biggest regret is surviving.

What I contend with is the burden of agency. The despair in knowing things are not hopeless. I can not say "I must be closeted" or "legal queer rights in Bangladesh are not possible" because I know these things to be false. I know possible are all things that we make them to be. I can not find solace in hopelessness. I can not say "there was nothing I could've done" or "this was beyond my hands" because I know these things to be lies that the powerful also say. If I was murdered or arrested/vanished, my agency properly robbed and I was made truly helpless and incapable of making change— then I could find in my inability to make change some semblance of peace. The self-allowance for rest.